



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2014

No. 20

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 3, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 2 p.m.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Guide our minds, thoughts, and desires this day. By Your spirit, breathe into us a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that we may fulfill Your will.

Bless the Members of this people's House. Give them attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas, they might sort out what is best for this Nation.

May their speech be deliberately free of all prejudice, that others might listen wholeheartedly. Grant that all dialogue be mutually respectful, surprising even the most jaded with the emergence of unity and justice.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOLDING led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### IRAN TARGETING AMERICA

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, as the Obama administration continues to

cut deals with the regime in Iran, Iranian military leaders pulled no punches in letting us know that they are prepared to strike our homeland, our forces in the Middle East, and our ally Israel.

These military leaders are at the real center of power in Tehran, pulling the strings behind the scenes. They are also the people who this administration is trusting to end their nuclear weapons program even though they invested heavily in keeping that same program hidden from the world for years. Iranian commanders just this past weekend went as far as to talk about destroying America from within and how we will face devastating consequences if we exercise our military option.

Madam Speaker, their words are just another reminder of how this administration has misplaced their trust and how the current deal with Iran jeopardizes our national security.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 p.m.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1517

and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

### MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS ALLOWABLE USE ACT

Mrs. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1791) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1791

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act”.*

#### SEC. 2. USE OF CERTAIN HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT FUNDS FOR ENHANCING MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS, MEDICAL SURGE CAPACITY, AND MASS PROPHYLAXIS CAPABILITIES.

*Section 2008 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a), by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (13) as paragraphs (11) through (14), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:*

*“(10) enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities, including the development and maintenance of an initial pharmaceutical stockpile, including medical kits, and diagnostics sufficient to protect first responders, their families, immediate victims, and vulnerable populations from a chemical or biological event;”;* and

*(2) in subsection (b)(3)(B), by striking “(a)(10)” and inserting “(a)(11)”.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1791, the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act, introduced by my colleague and the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, the honorable Congressman BILIRAKIS from Florida.

This bill amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make it clear that

grant funds under the State Homeland Security Grant Program and Urban Area Security Initiative may be used to enhance medical preparedness and purchase medical countermeasures.

The Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications Subcommittee held a series of hearings in the 112th Congress on medical preparedness. The subcommittee heard about the importance of medical countermeasures from representatives of the emergency response community, and this bill is in response to those concerns.

In August, I held a field hearing in my district looking at central Indiana's ability to handle a mass casualty event. Like the witnesses who testified at the hearings held in the 112th Congress, these witnesses at the field hearing stressed the importance of building medical preparedness.

As a result of this bill, grant funds could be used for items such as pre-deployed medical kits for first responders and their families, caches of equipment, training and exercises, and planning activities. The grant guidance for these programs currently allows funds to be used for medical preparedness equipment and activities.

This bill codifies those activities to ensure that they will continue to be allowable, and it will not cost any additional money to do so. We have seen the benefits that grant funds, including those used for medical preparedness activities, have provided when it comes to response capabilities. This was clearly demonstrated in response to the Boston Marathon bombings.

We know that the threat of chemical or biological attack is real. In fact, my subcommittee will be holding a hearing next week to get an update on the bioterrorism threat and preparedness here in this country.

We must ensure that our first responders have the tools and capabilities they need if such an event should occur. This bill has the support of several first responder groups, including the International Association of Emergency Managers, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the Emergency Services Coalition for Medical Preparedness. I will insert their letters of support into the RECORD.

H.R. 1791 was approved by the Committee on Homeland Security last year by a bipartisan voice vote. I am pleased that, during the markup, the committee approved an amendment offered by the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), to ensure that in addition to protecting first responders funds can also be used to protect vulnerable populations such as children.

I urge fellow Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES COALITION FOR MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS,

April 26, 2013.

Hon. GUS BILIRAKIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BILIRAKIS: The Emergency Services Coalition for Medical Preparedness is pleased to support the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act. The events of the last two weeks again demonstrate the need for immediate, at hand protections for our emergency services personnel and their families and households. The Congressionally-chartered WMD Commission has issued warnings for years about the continuing threat from biological weapons.

Emergency services professionals are uniquely expected to continue operating in hazardous conditions when others are sheltering. Whether responding to industrial fires, bombs placed in cities, or other situations with unknown secondary risks, the protections described in the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act will enable emergency services to more confidently carry out their tasks.

Pre-event medical caches have been provided for federal workers and hundreds of postal employees. Your bill addresses the lack of protection of the millions of local and state protectors who daily provide law enforcement, public works, emergency management, fire, rescue and emergency medical services.

The Coalition looks forward to working with you and your staff in passage of the Bill. Thank you for your leadership and continuing support for “protecting the protectors.”

Sincerely,

TIM STEPHENS,  
Advisor.

#### INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS, Fairfax, VA, April 26, 2013.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,  
Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the 12,000 chief fire and emergency officers of the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), I urge you to support the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act. This bill addresses an important aspect of America's homeland security and emergency preparedness through improving the resiliency of emergency first responders by helping provide pre-event Medkits to first responders and their families.

Individual physician-based prescription efforts and federal planning have already provided protections for countless employees of the U.S. Postal Service and the federal government—first responders however have not been included in these pre-event protections. The Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act addresses this gap by allowing jurisdictions to use the Urban Areas Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to improve their medical preparedness through the procurement of Medkits and other medical countermeasures.

In 2008, the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism issued their report in which the Commission identified a biological attack as the most likely threat to the United States. In the event of a biological attack, our nation's first responders will

play crucial roles such as treating patients and mitigating the effects of such a biological attack. One of the most effective ways to ensure the resiliency of emergency first responders is the provision of pre-event Medkits for first responders and their families. These Medkits will allow first responders to focus on protecting and serving the public rather than worrying about the safety of themselves or their families. The Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act will help jurisdictions provide these crucial protections to their first responders.

Thank you for your support for America's first responders. We urge you to continue your support by ensuring first responders and their families are protected while they protect their communities.

Sincerely,  
 CHIEF HANK CLEMMENSEN,  
*President and Chairman of the Board.*

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
 EMERGENCY MANAGERS,  
*Falls Church, VA, May 1, 2013.*

Hon. GUS BILIRAKIS,  
*House of Representatives,  
 Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BILIRAKIS: The U.S. Council of the International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM USA) is pleased to support the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act. We thank you for introducing a bill which addresses the lack of protection for the emergency services protectors by providing funding to enhance medical preparedness, medical surge capacity and mass prophylaxis capabilities. We were pleased to testify before you in support of a similar bill last session.

Helping local and state jurisdictions provide crucial protection to first responders, their families, and immediate victims from a chemical or biological event through Medkits and other medical countermeasures will ensure the resiliency of first responders. These Medkits will allow first responders to focus on protecting and serving the public rather than worrying about the safety of themselves or their families.

Thank you for your continued support to protect America's first responders and their families.

Sincerely,  
 JEFF WALKER,  
*CEM, IAEM USA President.*

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1791 the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1791 would formally authorize grant recipients under the State Homeland Security Grant or Urban Area Security Initiative programs to use the funding to enhance medical preparedness and medical surge capacity.

Although the Federal Emergency Management Agency already permits grantees to use these funds to enhance medical preparedness, this measure will give some predictability to grant recipients as they struggle to rebuild and maintain a robust medical response capability at the State and local level.

Additionally, I am proud to support this effort to provide resources that will equip our first responders with home medical kits. When disaster strikes, we have an obligation to protect our protectors. We also have an obligation to protect the most vulnerable in our communities.

During the full committee markup of H.R. 1791, the committee unanimously approved an amendment I offered. This amendment would ensure that resources are available to develop plans to distribute countermeasures to schools and child care facilities, the elderly, individuals with special needs, and low-income communities in the event of a biological incident.

I would like to thank the full committee chair, Mr. MCCAUL, and the subcommittee chairwoman, Mrs. BROOKS, for supporting my amendment. I also look forward to continuing to work with both of you in the future on other initiatives such as H.R. 3158, the SAFE in our Schools Act, to ensure that the needs of our schoolchildren and other vulnerable populations are adequately addressed in emergency preparedness and response plans.

On behalf of the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, I would also like to thank Chairman MCCAUL for working with us to reauthorize the Metropolitan Medical Response System, the MMRS. This program provided targeted grants to 124 highly populated jurisdictions to support the integration of emergency management, health and medical systems into an organized response to mass casualty events.

The program has not been funded since fiscal year 2011 and its authorization has lapsed. I sincerely hope that the next time we meet here on the House floor to address medical preparedness, it will be to consider bipartisan reauthorization legislation for the MMRS. As State and local governments continue to stretch their budgets to make up the reduced Federal support across many programs, we must make sure that the public health community is prepared and equipped to keep our constituents safe.

I look forward to working with my ranking member and the majority to ensure that MMRS remains a priority for this committee.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1791. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I must say, Madam Chair, you are doing an outstanding job chairing this committee. Thank you for your help on this bill. I also want to thank Mr. PAYNE. Your father would be very proud of you today. He was a good friend of mine.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1791, the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act, which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make it clear that grant funds under the State Homeland Security Grant Program and the Urban Area Security Initiative may be used to enhance medical preparedness and purchase medical countermeasures.

I originally introduced the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act in 2012

after a series of hearings on medical countermeasures in the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.

At these hearings, we received testimony from representatives of the emergency response community on the importance of stockpiling medical countermeasures in the event of a WMD attack. This includes pre-deployed medical kits for first responders and their families similar to those provided to postal workers participating in the national U.S. Postal Medical Countermeasures Dispensing Pilot Program.

The grant guidance for the State Homeland Security Grant Program and the Urban Area Security Initiative currently permits this funding to be used to procure medical countermeasures and for other medical preparedness and medical surge capacity equipment and activities. However, this guidance is developed on an annual basis, as our chair said, and there is no guarantee that these uses will be authorized in the future. That is why this bill is so very important.

To be clear, no new funding is authorized in this bill. However, these expenditures authorized and codified by the bill we are considering today can make a big difference in the protection of the public, including emergency responders, in the event of an attack, and there should be no doubt that grant funding may be used to support them now and in the future.

As the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I consistently find myself in awe of our first responders and the sacrifices that they make for the public. In the wake of events such as Hurricane Sandy, I am committed to ensuring Congress does all that it can to support those brave men and women.

I am pleased that this legislation is supported by the Emergency Services Coalition on Medical Preparedness, which works to ensure that we "protect the protectors," and other agencies as well. I also thank the ranking member for adding that great amendment because we must protect our children as well.

I thank and commend, of course, Representative SUSAN BROOKS, our chair, for her assistance with this bill and for her willingness to join me as an original cosponsor.

I urge all Members to support this great, very important bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge passage of this measure as a small step to address gaping needs at the State and local level when it comes to medical preparedness.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1791, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida

noted in his statement, this bill passed the House the last Congress by a bipartisan vote of 397–1. I hope Members will once again express their support for the men and women who protect us every day by voting for this bill.

I want to thank my ranking member for his dedication and his commitment to protecting the protectors, as he so eloquently stated, and we certainly request that our fellow Members support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1791, the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act for two reasons.

First, the bill will save lives. Second, the legislation is necessary to support the vital work of first responders in the event of a biological and chemical terrorists attack or incident.

The legislation provides for the development and maintenance of an initial pharmaceutical stockpile, including medical kits, and diagnostics sufficient to protect first responders, their families, and immediate victims from a chemical or biological event.

The Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act will amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities.

This legislation ensures that first responders have necessary medicines and treatments to protect themselves, their families and those within their vicinity immediately should a biological and chemical terrorist attack occurs.

In short, first responders will not be able to do the work of saving lives if they fall victim to an attack or are distracted by worry regarding how their family may be fairing during a biological or chemical attack should one occur.

First responders often include law enforcement officers, fire fighters, and emergency medical personnel.

The city of Houston covers over a 1000 square mile region in Southeast Texas. It has an evening population of nearly two million people and over three million during the day when commuters are in the city.

There are 103 fire stations that serve the city of Houston with most offering ambulance or medic support, but there is only one station, Number 22, that specializes in hazardous material.

In the city of Houston one out of every ten citizens use Emergency Management Services (EMS) and within a year there are over 200,000 EMS incidents involving over 225,000 patients or potential patients.

EMS response services have 88 City of Houston EMS vehicles, with just under fifty percent staffed by two paramedics and can provide Advanced Life Support (ALS) to patients.

These consist of 15 ALS Squads, and 22 ALS transport units with eight functioning in a "Dual" capacity as both Advanced Life Support and Basic Life Support (BLS).

The remaining fifty-one transport units are Basic Life Support (BLS), and staffed by two Emergency Medical Technicians.

Law enforcement agencies that serve the city of Houston include the Houston Police Department, Harris County Sheriff's Department, Harris County Constables, Port of Houston Authority Police and Corrections Officers.

Because of the nature of chemical or biological terrorist attacks mass casualties are the objective and the impressive resources of our nation's 4th largest city would likely be overwhelmed immediately should an attack occur it is important to provide them with the resources provided by this legislation.

The prepositioning of resources in the form of medicines that can support pulmonary respiratory function or arrest neurological damage as a result of poisoning lives can be saved that could otherwise be lost. This bill can reduce deaths and give victims the greatest chance for survival and recovery.

Emergency responders because of this bill would have treatments in the communities where they serve and live to help neighbors, coworkers, and people who are immediate need to live saving help.

As a senior member of the House Homeland Security Committee, I am mindful of the need for our first responders to be prepared and well trained to manage a wide range of potential threats both conventional and unconventional.

This bill offers one more resource that will be available to first responders to do the work they have dedicated their lives to doing—saving lives.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1791, the Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act for two reasons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1791, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1715

## GI BILL TUITION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 357) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the educational assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 357

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act of 2013".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References to title 38, United States Code.

Sec. 3. Scoring of budgetary effects.

Sec. 4. Approval of courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education for purposes of All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and Post-9/11 Educational Assistance conditional on in-State tuition rate for veterans.

Sec. 5. Clarification of eligibility for services under the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program.

Sec. 6. Extension of eligibility period for vocational rehabilitation programs.

Sec. 7. Work-study allowance.

Sec. 8. Responsibilities of the Directors of Veterans' Employment and Training.

Sec. 9. Contents of Transition Assistance Program.

Sec. 10. Rounding down of increase in rates of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation.

Sec. 11. Limitation on performance awards in the senior executive service.

Sec. 12. Semiannual reports to Congress on cost of certain travel.

Sec. 13. Report of infectious disease at medical facilities of Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 14. Prohibition of visual recording without informed consent.

Sec. 15. Two-month extension of Veterans Retraining Assistance Program.

### SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

### SEC. 3. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

### SEC. 4. APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR PURPOSES OF ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE CONDITIONAL ON IN-STATE TUITION RATE FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3679 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter and subject to paragraphs (3) through (6), the Secretary shall disapprove a course of education provided by a public institution of higher education to a covered individual pursuing a course of education with educational assistance under chapter 30 or 33 of this title while living in the State in which the public institution of higher education is located if the institution charges tuition and fees for that course for the covered individual at a rate that is higher than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State in which the institution is located, regardless of the covered individual's State of residence.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, a covered individual is a veteran who was discharged or released from a period of not fewer than 90 days of service in the active military, naval, or air service less than three years before the date of enrollment in the course concerned

“(3) If after enrollment in a course of education that is subject to disapproval under paragraph (1) a covered individual pursues one or more courses of education at the same public institution of higher education while remaining continuously enrolled (other than during regularly scheduled breaks between courses, semesters or terms) at that institution of higher education, any course so pursued by the covered individual at that institution of higher education while so continuously enrolled shall also be subject to disapproval under paragraph (1).

“(4) It shall not be grounds to disapprove a course of education under paragraph (1) if a public institution of higher education requires a covered individual pursuing a course of education at the institution to demonstrate an intent, by means other than satisfying a physical presence requirement, to establish residency in the State in which the institution is located, or to satisfy other requirements not relating to the establishment of residency, in order to be charged tuition and fees for that course at a rate that is equal to or less than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State.

“(5) The Secretary may waive such requirements of paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(6) Disapproval under paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to educational assistance under chapters 30 and 33 of this title.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (c) of section 3679 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), shall apply with respect to educational assistance provided for pursuit of programs of education during academic terms that begin after July 1, 2016, through courses of education that commence on or after that date.

#### **SEC. 5. CLARIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES UNDER THE HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.**

Subsection (a) of section 2021 is amended by striking “reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force.” and inserting the following: “reintegration into the labor force of—”

“(1) homeless veterans;

“(2) veterans participating in the Department of Veterans Affairs supported housing program for which rental assistance provided pursuant to section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)); and

“(3) veterans who are transitioning from being incarcerated.”.

#### **SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF ELIGIBILITY PERIOD FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 3103 is amended by striking “twelve-year period” and inserting “17-year period” each place it appears.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a veteran applying for assistance under chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 7. WORK-STUDY ALLOWANCE.**

Section 3485(a)(4) is amended by striking “June 30, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2018”.

#### **SEC. 8. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTORS OF VETERANS’ EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.**

Section 4103 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Each Director assigned to a State under subsection (a) shall carry out the following responsibilities:

“(1) Monitoring the performance of veterans’ training and employment programs in the State, with special emphasis on services to disabled veterans.

“(2) Monitoring the performance of the State workforce agency in complying with section 4212 of this title.

“(3) Suggesting to the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training corrective actions that could be taken by the State workforce agency to address deficiencies in the performance of veterans’ training and employment programs in the State.

“(4) Annually negotiating with the State workforce agency to establish performance goals for veterans’ training and employment programs in the State.

“(5) Reviewing the State’s requests for funding for veterans’ training and employment programs and providing advice to the State workforce agency and the Assistant Secretary regarding such funding requests.

“(6) Forwarding complaints regarding possible violations of chapter 43 of this title to the appropriate Regional Administrator or to the to the Assistant Secretary, as required.

“(7) Carrying out grant officer technical representative responsibilities for grants issued under programs administered by the Department.

“(8) Providing advice to the State workforce agency on strategies to market veterans to employers.

“(9) Supervising and managing all support staff, including Assistant Directors, establishing workload priorities, managing all personnel actions, and evaluating all assigned personnel.

“(10) Submitting to the Assistant Secretary regular reports on the matters described in paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (8), and any other matters the Assistant Secretary determine appropriate.

“(11) Performing such other related duties as directed by the Assistant Secretary.”.

#### **SEC. 9. CONTENTS OF TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) Provide information about disability-related employment and education protections.”.

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e), as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.**—The mandatory program carried out by this section shall include—

“(1) for any such member who plans to use the member’s entitlement to educational assistance under title 38—

“(A) instruction providing an overview of the use of such entitlement; and

“(B) courses of post-secondary education appropriate for the member, courses of post-secondary education compatible with the member’s education goals, and instruction on how to finance the member’s post-secondary education; and

“(2) instruction in the benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and in other subjects determined by the Secretary concerned.”.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.**—The program carried out under section 1144 of

title 10, United States Code, shall comply with the requirements of subsections (b)(9) and (c) of such section, as added by subsection (a), by not later than April 1, 2015.

(c) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives the results of a study carried out by the Secretary to determine the feasibility of providing the instruction described in subsection (b) of section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, at all overseas locations where such instruction is provided by entering into a contract jointly with the Secretary of Labor for the provision of such instruction.

#### **SEC. 10. ROUNDING DOWN OF INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.**

(a) **ROUNDING.**—Each dollar amount increased under section 2 of the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-52), if not a whole dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a payment made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 11. LIMITATION ON PERFORMANCE AWARDS IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.**

For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not make any performance awards under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code.

#### **SEC. 12. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON COST OF CERTAIN TRAVEL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter I of chapter 5 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### **“§518. Semiannual reports to Congress on cost of certain travel**

“(a) **SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than June 30, 2014, and not later than 60 days after each 180-day period thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate a semiannual report on covered travel made during the 180-day period covered by the report.

“(b) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—Each report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) With respect to each instance of covered travel made during the period covered by the report—

“(A) the purpose of such travel;

“(B) the destination;

“(C) the name and title of each employee included on such travel;

“(D) the duration of such travel;

“(E) the total cost to the Department of such travel; and

“(F) with respect to covered travel described in subsection (d)(2), the identity of the person or entity that paid or reimbursed for such travel.

“(2) The final costs to the Department with respect to all covered travel made during the period covered by the report, including costs relating to—

“(A) transportation, including fares for travel by air, rail, bus, ferry, cruise ship, taxi, mass transit, or other mode of transportation;

“(B) expenses or reimbursements relating to operating and maintaining a car, including the costs of fuel and mileage;

“(C) passport and visa fees;

“(D) lodging;

“(E) per diem payments;

- “(F) baggage charges;
- “(G) computer rental fees;
- “(H) rental of halls, auditoriums, or other spaces;
- “(I) entertainment;
- “(J) contractors; and
- “(K) registration fees; and
- “(L) promotional items.

“(C) **DUPLICATIVE INFORMATION.**—Each report under subsection (a) shall include the information described in subsection (b) regardless of whether such information is also included in a report under section 517 of this title.

“(d) **COVERED TRAVEL DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘covered travel’ means travel made by an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including an employee who is stationed in a foreign country, on official business to any of the following locations:

“(1) If the Department or other element of the Federal Government pays for such travel, a location outside of—

- “(A) the several States;
- “(B) the District of Columbia;
- “(C) a territory, commonwealth, or possession of the United States;

“(D) Indian lands (as defined in section 4(4) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703(4))); or

“(E) the territorial waters of the United States.

“(2) If any person or entity other than the Federal Government pays (or reimburses) for such travel, any location, regardless of whether the location is inside or outside of the United States.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 517 the following new item:

“518. Semiannual reports to Congress on cost of certain travel.”

### **SEC. 13. REPORT OF INFECTIOUS DISEASE AT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7311 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) The Secretary shall report to the appropriate entity each case of a notifiable infectious disease or condition that is diagnosed at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs in accordance with the laws of the State in which the facility is located.

“(2) In addition to reporting each case of a notifiable infectious disease or condition at a medical facility of the Department pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall report each such case that is classified as a health-care-associated infection sentinel event to the accrediting organization of such facility.

“(3)(A) If the Secretary fails to report a case of a notifiable infectious disease or condition at a medical facility of the Department in accordance with State law pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(i) take any remedial action required under the laws of the State to correct such failure; and

“(ii) if the Secretary does not correct such failure pursuant to clause (i), pay to the State an amount equal to the amount that a medical facility not owned by the Federal Government that is located in the same State would pay as a penalty to such State for such failure.

“(B) The State may file a civil action against the Secretary in the United States district court for the district in which the medical facility is located to recover from the United States the amount described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(C) A civil action under subparagraph (B) may not be commenced later than two years after the cause of action accrues.

“(4)(A) In any case in which the Inspector General of the Department suspects that a director of a Veterans Integrated Service Network has failed to comply with an applicable provision of this subsection, the Inspector General shall conduct an investigation to determine whether such director failed to comply with an applicable provision of this section.

“(B) If the Inspector General determines under subparagraph (A) that a director has failed to comply with a provision of this subsection, the Secretary shall suspend such director for such period as the Secretary considers appropriate under subchapter I or subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be. In addition to such suspension, the Secretary may impose such other administrative disciplinary action on the director as the Secretary considers appropriate and for which the Secretary is otherwise authorized.

“(5) The Secretary shall—

“(A) maintain records of each notifiable infectious disease or condition reported pursuant to paragraph (1); and

“(B) submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a notification of each such notifiable infectious disease or condition.

“(6) In this subsection, the term ‘notifiable infectious disease or condition’ means any infectious disease or condition that is—

“(A) on the list of nationally notifiable diseases or conditions published by the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; or

“(B) covered by a provision of law of a State that requires the reporting of infectious diseases or conditions.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The reporting requirement under section 7311(f) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to a case of a notifiable infectious disease or condition diagnosed at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

### **SEC. 14. PROHIBITION OF VISUAL RECORDING WITHOUT INFORMED CONSENT.**

Section 7331 is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary, upon” and inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, upon”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **VISUAL RECORDING.**—(1) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations establishing procedures to ensure that, except as provided by paragraph (2), any visual recording made by the Secretary of a patient during the course of furnishing care under this title is carried out only with the full and informed consent of the patient or, in appropriate cases, a representative thereof.

“(2) The Secretary may waive the requirement for informed consent under paragraph (1) with respect to the visual recording of a patient if such recording is made—

“(A) pursuant to a determination by a physician or psychologist that such recording is medically necessary or necessary for the safety of the patient;

“(B) pursuant to a warrant or order of a court of competent jurisdiction; or

“(C) in a public setting where a person would not have a reasonable expectation to privacy, such as a waiting room or hallway, and such recording is for general security purposes not particularized to the patient.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘visual recording’ means the recording or transmission of images or video, but does not include—

“(A) medical imaging, including such imaging produced by radiographic procedures,

nuclear medicine, endoscopy, ultrasound, or other similar procedures; or

“(B) images, video, and other clinical information transmitted for the purposes of providing treatment through telehealth and telemedicine technologies.”

### **SEC. 15. TWO-MONTH EXTENSION OF VETERANS RETRAINING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

Section 211 of the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–56; 125 Stat. 713; 38 U.S.C. 4100 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “March 31, 2014” and inserting “May 31, 2014”; and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking “March 31, 2014” and inserting “May 31, 2014”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 357, as amended, is a bipartisan package of legislation that relates to improving employment and training opportunities for America’s veterans. While there are many worthwhile provisions in this bill, I want to focus on section 4 primarily, which deals with in-state tuition for veterans, and section 14, which ensures privacy of veterans who are being treated at a VA medical facility.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation’s veterans have always been a source of strength for America’s economy. The post-9/11 GI Bill has given thousands of our veterans the opportunity to attend college or receive other types of vocational training at little to no cost to the veteran themselves.

Every dollar that we provide in education and training benefits to veterans under the GI Bill goes right back into our economy when these veterans graduate and enter the workforce. I think we can all call that a great investment.

However, there are many veterans, through no fault of their own, who are forced to pay exorbitant tuition rates to schools simply because of the transit nature of their military service, and that precludes them from meeting some of the burdensome State residency requirements.

Mr. Speaker, as most American families know, the difference between in-state versus out-of-state tuition at most public schools is immense. According to the College Board, the average in-state tuition and fees at public institutions is now \$8,655 a year. Out-of-state students pay an average of \$21,706 per year.

Since the post-9/11 GI Bill will only pay for tuition and fees at the in-state rates at public schools, out-of-state student veterans could incur significant debt to make up that difference. I believe that this practice has got to end.

The men and women who served this Nation did not just defend the citizens of their own home States, but the citizens of all 50 States. The educational



benefits they receive from the taxpayers should reflect the same reality.

Mr. Speaker, many States are out in front on this issue, including my home State of Florida, and I applaud the 22 States that currently offer some form of instate tuition to veterans, regardless of their residency.

Other State legislatures again, as I said, including my home State of Florida, are currently reviewing legislation to provide this benefit. It is my hope that the House passes this bill, and it will encourage those States to move forward.

To that end, section 4 of the bill would require that, in order for public colleges and universities to be eligible to receive payments from a veteran's GI Bill benefits, they must enroll these veterans at instate tuition and fee rates.

There are important limitations to this requirement. First, States would be permitted to require that student veterans show intent to become full-time residents of the State in which they are attending school.

Secondly, the instate requirement would only apply to veterans who are attending college within 3 years of their discharge from Active Duty. These limitations will ensure that this policy not only targets the population of veterans that are most adversely affected by residency requirements following their military separation, but also fairly recognizes States' legitimate interest in subsidizing public education for its taxpaying citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to highlight section 14 of the bill, which incorporates the text of a bill that I introduced called the Veterans' Privacy Act.

In June of 2012, a covert camera disguised as a smoke detector was installed in the room of a brain-damaged veteran who was being treated at the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital in Tampa. Upon discovering the hidden camera, the veteran's family was understandably outraged. When the veteran's family asked about the camera, VA officials first stated that the camera did not exist. Then they changed their story and admitted that the "smoke detector" was actually a video camera.

When further asked if the camera was recording, the VA told the family that the camera was only monitoring the patient; it was not recording. Only after inquiries by local media and the Veterans' Affairs Committee did VA admit that the camera was, in fact, recording the patient. VA then removed the camera from the patient's room.

In the wake of this incident, I sent a letter to VA asking for its legal authority to place a camera in a patient's room without their consent. The VA replied that the hidden camera did not violate the law.

I am deeply disturbed at VA's actions and response to the privacy interests of this veteran and can't help but wonder whether similar incidents are occurring across the country. That is why I

authored this section, which should direct VA to prescribe regulations ensuring that when veterans receive care from VA, their privacy will not be violated by unauthorized video surveillance.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there are many other worthwhile provisions in this bill, and I defer to my colleagues on the floor this afternoon to highlight other remaining provisions.

I thank my good friends and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), and everybody who is here today who are cosponsors of this bill and helping us to move forward.

I am also grateful to Leader CANTOR and Speaker BOEHNER for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor.

With that, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 357, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As one of Riverside County's Representatives, a county that has the eighth-largest veterans' population in the Nation, I proudly rise today in support of H.R. 357, as amended. This bill is a far-ranging bill that seeks to improve the lives of our veterans.

H.R. 357 includes a number of measures that were considered by the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity and was reported favorably out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee last June.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER of the full committee, and Chairman FLORES of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, for their leadership. I especially enjoyed holding several field hearings last year with Chairman FLORES in our respective districts.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has traditionally been a bipartisan committee, and I am pleased to see that cooperation continue as both leaders helped bring this bill to the floor today.

In the area of education, H.R. 357 would require all public colleges and universities using the GI Bill to provide all veterans with instate tuition rates. Currently, veterans who have not established residency at the school of their choice must pay out-of-state tuition rates.

In order to fulfill their military obligations, servicemembers must uproot their families and periodically move around the country. This makes it difficult to establish residency for purposes of instate tuition rates when veterans seek to use their GI Bill benefits. By providing all veterans with instate tuition rates, H.R. 357 will make it easier for veterans to choose the educational institution that best serves their needs.

The new Transition Assistance Program includes a mandatory 5-day core program of instruction that all separating servicemembers are required to take. The education portion is an optional track available to all members

but is not required. Some separating servicemembers may not have additional time to take an optional course.

H.R. 357 would move the education track to the mandatory portion for veterans seeking to use their GI Bill benefits, which will ensure that these veterans can make better choices regarding their education and assist them in making the most of their GI Bill benefits.

In addition, H.R. 357 also extends the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program for 2 months to better align the program with the traditional academic semester.

Now, in addition to these provisions, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight two sections which I have sponsored and which are included in H.R. 357. I believe these sections will also assist our veterans in terms of their education and in finding work after their separation from the military.

Section 6 is from the first bill I introduced, H.R. 844, the VetSuccess Enhancement Act. This provision would extend from 12 years to 17 years the eligibility period that veterans with service-connected disabilities have to enroll in VA vocational rehabilitation and employment programs.

Veterans with traumatic brain injury or spinal cord injury often require years to complete rehabilitation and adjust to the new realities of day-to-day living. Only then can these veterans consider returning to work. This provision will provide these veterans with the additional time they need to seek vocational rehabilitative services.

Section 7 is from another bill I introduced, H.R. 1453, the Work-Study for Student Veterans Act. This section provides for a 5-year extension of the Veterans Work-Study program at the VA.

As an educator, I know how important these programs are to students to enable them to fit some part-time work into their academic term. The VA program pays veterans to perform a variety of tasks, including assisting other transitioning veterans by helping them with outreach.

By providing support in the college Office of Veterans' Affairs, these students help other veterans to navigate the VA system. It is an important program to veteran students in my district and to thousands of others in schools across the country.

The last provision that tackles transition issues would codify the major duties of the directors and assistant directors from the Department of Labor's Veterans' Employment and Training Services.

At present, there is no standardization of the requirements and duties of these positions. H.R. 357 will provide more consistency in the services provided veterans by standardizing the responsibilities of these officials. In addition, codifying their duties will enable us to better track their funding, review their performance and hold everyone accountable to the same standard.

These are important changes to the educational benefits and transition services for our veterans and will better assist veterans in serving our communities and our Nation after they leave service.

Finally, in terms of fighting veteran homelessness and improving VA medical care, H.R. 357 would clarify that veterans who are homeless and participating in the HUD-VASH voucher program, and those who are transitioning from incarceration, are eligible for services under the Homeless Veteran Reintegration Program, or the HVRP. I am sure that all these veterans will find these services very beneficial as they look to begin the next chapter in their lives.

H.R. 357 would require the VA to more consistently report infectious diseases diagnosed at VA medical facilities to State authorities to increase the likelihood that infectious disease outbreaks that may occur are addressed sooner and more comprehensively.

Although we have expressed concerns over the enforcement mechanism included in this provision, we all can support the importance of comprehensive notification.

H.R. 357 also includes a provision that would protect a veteran's personal privacy by directing the VA to ensure that any visual recording made of a patient during treatment is carried out only with the full and informed consent of that patient.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, GUS BILIRAKIS, the vice chairman of the full committee and sponsor for veterans not only in his community but around this country.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, Chairman MILLER, for all of his good work on behalf of our true American heroes, and I also want to thank the ranking member for his good work on behalf of this particular bill and all of its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act of 2013. This is an important package of veterans' legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, that works to increase access for our Nation's heroes and the benefits they have earned through their service to our country. In particular, I want to highlight three sections of this legislation that I am very proud to support.

H.R. 357 will make informed changes to the GI Bill program that will allow States to jump-start the process to provide instate tuition to veterans. The bill would require that in order for an educational institution to receive GI Bill funding, they must offer instate tuition to veterans, regardless of the veteran's residency. That is the least

we can do. And I really appreciate the chair sponsoring this provision.

Mr. Speaker, our members of the armed services are not given options as to where they will reside. They move according to the needs of the military. It is only fitting that, when these veterans use their earned benefits, they are not penalized because of residency requirements that they have no control over.

H.R. 357 also provides an extension of the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program, also originally sponsored by our chair. This important program offers 12 months of training assistance to unemployed veterans between the ages of 35 and 60. Again, it is the least we can do. During these difficult economic times, it is important that we do everything we can to assist our veterans in their job search and retraining efforts.

I also want to commend the chairman for another provision, and it is the VA's patients' privacy act. And, of course, we need to give our veterans the privacy that they so deserve, as patients.

I would like to urge all our Members to support this great bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), who is also the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor and my colleague and fellow educator, Mr. TAKANO, for yielding to me.

I rise today in support of H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act of 2013. As professor emeritus of political science at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, I know firsthand the importance of a college education. And I am proud that my home State of Nevada already has laws in place that allow all veterans, regardless of residency status, to pay instate tuition while attending our public colleges and universities.

I was fortunate to teach a number of our Nation's heroes during my time at UNLV. Having these veterans in class was truly a win-win situation. Our veterans are able to pursue a college degree to help them with their transition to civilian life, and their fellow students are able to benefit from hearing about the veterans' experiences in the military, on the battlefield, and in foreign lands while they have served our country.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation that will improve our higher education system and help our Nation's heroes acquire the skills and knowledge to complement their experience so they can succeed once they leave the military.

I thank the chairman again for bringing this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 357 and, in particular, section 13, which encompasses my legislation, the Infectious Disease Reporting Act.

Section 13 imposes necessary requirements on the Department of Veterans Affairs to report infectious disease outbreaks at their medical facilities. These requirements are a response to infectious disease problems at VA facilities that were uncovered by my subcommittee's investigations last year. The investigations highlighted a deadly outbreak of Legionnaires' disease at the Pittsburgh VA from February 2011 to November 2012 which tragically caused the deaths of at least five veterans and afflicted as many as 22 others.

According to medical experts, timely disease surveillance is critical to infectious disease control; and delayed, incomplete, or inconsistent disease reporting can compromise an effective public health response and result in further infectious disease outbreaks.

Although it has become clear that these deaths could have been prevented with proper procedures, the VA failed to act appropriately within widely accepted medical practices. Surprisingly, the VA is not required by current law to report the incidence of infectious diseases at their facilities to State and local public health officials.

As one of the Nation's largest health care providers, VA should set the standard for infectious disease reporting. However, they do not even participate in infectious disease reporting like all other medical facilities within a particular State, creating a public health risk to those localities with VA facilities.

In response, section 13 requires the VA to report each case of an infectious disease in accordance with the laws of the State in which the facility is located.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN. And failure to report will subject the VA facility to State penalties. These penalties are vital to ensure the VA will comply with and improve their reporting requirements.

Given the VA's recent inadequate responses to infectious disease outbreaks, it is imperative that Congress and our veterans demand improvements. Therefore, I urge full support of section 13 of H.R. 357, as well as the passage of the entire bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), a great champion of veterans and former member of this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 357, the GI Bill



Tuition Fairness Act. This legislation contains a number of important changes in VA programs that provide our veterans with education, training, rehabilitation, disability benefits, and housing; and it deserves our support.

I want to focus my remarks today on the disease reporting provisions in the bill because I have been deeply involved with that issue over the last year or so.

In November of 2012, the VA announced that there had been an outbreak of Legionnaires' disease at a VA hospital in Pittsburgh, which I represent. Shortly thereafter, I joined other members of the regional congressional delegation in requesting investigations into the outbreak. In response, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the VA Inspector General's Office examined the outbreak and the events leading up to it at length. The Centers for Disease Control also looked into the outbreak and determined that it had resulted in several deaths and more than two dozen illnesses.

I want to personally express my gratitude to my good friend Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman JEFF MILLER, Oversight Subcommittee Chairman COFFMAN, and Ranking Member MICHAUD for being so responsive to our requests for investigations and investigating the outbreak and holding hearings on it last year.

In the end, the hearings and investigations identified a number of shortcomings in the way the outbreak was handled and the need to be addressed. One of the concerns raised, as we learned more about the outbreak, was that for some time after the local VA facility knew it had Legionella bacteria in its water supply and that VA patients had been sickened by it, it had not notified State or local health agencies about the outbreak. Under current law, VA is not required to make such reports, which are required of all other hospitals.

Chairman MILLER, Subcommittee Chairman COFFMAN, Senator CASEY, and Congressmen MURPHY, ROTHFUS, and I all agree that in the future the VA should be required to report outbreaks of potentially deadly diseases to public health authorities, just like other hospitals already do.

The language in this bill is the result of our discussions over a number of months. I believe that the need for this reporting requirement is obvious. I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will make this important change.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) for being in the forefront on this particular issue.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the 12th District of Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our Nation's veterans and the legislation currently under consideration. This legislation makes much-needed reforms that would bring

accountability and transparency to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Over the past year, I have worked with Chairman MILLER and Chairman COFFMAN, my western Pennsylvania colleagues—Congressmen DOYLE, MURPHY, KELLY, and SHUSTER—and local veterans' families to investigate the outbreak of Legionnaires' disease at the Pittsburgh VA.

The VA Office of the Inspector General determined systemic failures surrounding the outbreak led to tragic and preventable deaths of local veterans. We must do all we can to ensure that this does not happen again.

Chairman COFFMAN's Infectious Disease Reporting Act, which I strongly support, has been included in today's legislation. This commonsense reform will increase transparency and save lives by improving infectious disease reporting requirements and requiring the VA to follow the same rules as the rest of our world-class health care institutions in western Pennsylvania.

Today's legislation also builds on an amendment I offered last year that prohibits bonuses for senior VA executives. This money would be better spent resolving the VA disability claims backlog and ensuring that our veterans are receiving the first-rate care they have earned.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this legislation, and I look forward to continuing to working with my colleagues in Congress to serve our Nation's veterans.

Mr. TAKANO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the 18th District of Pennsylvania, Dr. MURPHY, a Navy Reservist himself.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, "Sonny" Calcagno, age 85; John Ciarolla, age 83; Clark Compston, age 74; John McChesney, age 63; William Nicklas, age 87; and "Mitch" Wanstreet, age 65 are the victims of the Legionnaires' disease outbreak at the Pittsburgh VA health care system in 2011 and 2012. We can never really heal the emotional scars that these families have suffered and the 21 additional families who had a family member with a case of Legionnaires', but we can work to make sure something like this doesn't happen again.

Today's legislation fixes one of the flaws uncovered during this investigation; and under this bill, VA hospitals will soon follow the same reporting requirements for infectious diseases as other medical facilities. This way, public health authorities will know when a disease outbreak occurs and can take immediate action.

Thanks to the dogged determination and diligence of Chairman MILLER, Congressman COFFMAN, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the ranking member, and my colleagues, Messrs. DOYLE, ROTHFUS, and KELLY, we now know the Legionnaires' outbreak was entirely preventable except for the gross mismanagement and negligence of a few key officials at the Pittsburgh VA.

The inspector general's report revealed some troubling findings. The VA lacked proper documentation and maintenance of the water system, and was lax in properly informing and testing patients. Further, the VA did not communicate properly with the hospital system in the detection of Legionella. That is why this bill is necessary, because timely reporting and transparency requires adherence to the strongest standards, followed by quick action.

But with this, our work is not yet done. It has been more than 2 months since I last asked VA Secretary General Shinseki to tell Congress what has been done to hold accountable those who are responsible for this outbreak, and his agency has promised to do so. But Congress is still waiting for an answer.

□ 1745

Transparency and accountability are essential for the Secretary to rebuild the trust in the VA. We are grateful to our veterans for their service and grateful to the hard workers of the VA hospital system. The Pittsburgh VA has been a leader in infection control work and should be commended for that, but, in this case, the failures of some are simply unacceptable.

My hope is that through this bill requiring reporting of infection cases we will be able to restore the trust that the VA has with its veterans and their families. It is so critically needed in order to make these essential changes.

I ask for my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Does the gentleman from Florida have additional speakers?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker at this time.

Mr. TAKANO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the Third District of the State of Pennsylvania, MIKE KELLY, who is a stalwart supporter of the veterans in the State of Pennsylvania and also the United States.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act of 2013, a bill introduced by my friend, Representative JEFF MILLER, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I wish to highlight section 13, which includes H.R. 1792, the Infectious Disease Reporting Act, a bill introduced by my friend, Representative MIKE COFFMAN, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. The Infectious Disease Reporting Act is a bill that I am proud to cosponsor.

This commonsense provision is necessary to respond to infectious disease issues at VA facilities nationwide, including the deadly outbreak of Legionnaires' Disease at the Pittsburgh VA in

2011 and 2012 that killed at least five of our veterans and sickened as many as 22. This facility became ground zero for the Veterans' Affairs Committee's investigation, which found gross mismanagement by the Pittsburgh VA in response to the 2011 outbreak. This is particularly troubling to me as there are many veterans in my district who rely on the Pittsburgh VA for their health care.

Currently, the VA facilities are not required by law to report infectious disease at VA facilities to State and local health officials, even though the VA is one of the Nation's largest health providers; yet, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center—it is only a few hundred feet away—is required to do this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This inconsistency makes absolutely no sense and leaves the VA off the hook. In other words, this bill holds VA facilities accountable to the same standards as other medical facilities located in the same State. This just makes sense.

Now, our veterans, who have sacrificed so much, deserve far better. This bill is a step in the right direction to ensure that veterans receive safe, high quality health care at the VA. I urge strong support of H.R. 357.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, H.R. 357 makes important changes to the benefits and services we provide veterans and to the manner in which we provide them. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 357, as amended.

I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members would have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials that they may have on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Thank you to all the Members who have come to the floor today to support this bill. I encourage all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act. In addition to requiring all public institutions to give veterans in-state tuition rates as a condition of receiving GI Bill education benefits, this legislation also includes a five year limitation on executive bonuses at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Under current practice, the VA pays out about \$400 million in bonuses each year. Recently, we have seen these bonuses too often go to people whose work does not merit a reward, and to the contrary, may even warrant reprimand.

This practice has been evident at the Atlanta VA Medical Center, where despite the

fact that four unexpected deaths were attributed to mismanagement and lack of oversight, tens of thousands of dollars in bonuses were awarded to top level executives at the facility. At the Charlie Norwood VA Medical Center in Augusta, three patients died after management failed to act in a timely manner to schedule appointments. Despite requests to the VA, we are still waiting to hear whether those responsible received bonuses instead of reprimands.

It is past time that we stop blindly handing out rewards pay—bonuses should be the exception, not the norm. Furthermore, at a time when so many of our soldiers are returning from war, and in light of the deaths in Atlanta, I believe the VA should prioritize veterans' health and well-being above all else.

Mr. Speaker, we should reward our veterans with quality care and services in exchange for their commitment to our country and our freedoms. I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing support for our nation's veterans by supporting H.R. 357.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 357, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE (during consideration of H.R. 357). Mr. Speaker, on January 29, I was not present when H.R. 2642, the conference report for the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, better known as the farm bill, was voted on. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1791, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 357, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS ALLOWABLE USE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1791) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 2, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—391

Aderholt	Clay	Fleming
Bachmann	Cleaver	Flores
Bachus	Clyburn	Forbes
Barber	Coble	Fortenberry
Barletta	Coffman	Foster
Barr	Cohen	Fox
Barrow (GA)	Cole	Frankel (FL)
Barton	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Bass	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Beatty	Conaway	Fudge
Becerra	Connolly	Gabbard
Benish	Conyers	Gallego
Bentivolio	Cook	Garamendi
Bera (CA)	Cooper	Garcia
Bilirakis	Costa	Gardner
Bishop (GA)	Cotton	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Courtney	Gibbs
Black	Cramer	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Crawford	Gohmert
Blumenauer	Crowley	Goodlatte
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gowdy
Boustany	Culberson	Granger
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Daines	Graves (MO)
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Green, Al
Brooks (AL)	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Brooks (IN)	DeGette	Griffin (AR)
Brown (GA)	Delaney	Griffith (VA)
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Grimm
Bucshon	Denham	Guthrie
Burgess	Dent	Hahn
Bustos	DesJarlais	Hall
Butterfield	Deutch	Hanabusa
Byrne	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Calvert	Dingell	Harper
Camp	Doggett	Harris
Cantor	Doyle	Hartzler
Capito	Duckworth	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Capuano	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Cárdenas	Duncan (TN)	Heck (WA)
Carney	Edwards	Hensarling
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Herrera Beutler
Carter	Ellmers	Higgins
Cartwright	Engel	Himes
Castor (FL)	Enyart	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Holding
Chabot	Esty	Holt
Chaffetz	Farenthold	Honda
Chu	Farr	Horsford
Ciçilline	Fattah	Hoyer
Clark (MA)	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Clarke (NY)	Fleischmann	Huelskamp

Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Marchant  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers

McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)

Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

## NAYS—2

Amash

Massie

## NOT VOTING—38

Amodi  
Andrews  
Bishop (NY)  
Buchanan  
Campbell  
Cassidy  
Crenshaw  
Davis, Danny  
DeSantis  
Fincher  
Gerlach  
Gibson  
Gosar

Gutiérrez  
Kingston  
Lynch  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
McCarthy (NY)  
Meeks  
Meng  
Miller, Gary  
Moran  
Richmond  
Rogers (AL)  
Runyan

Rush  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schwartz  
Sensenbrenner  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stockman  
Tiberi  
Tsongas  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Yarmuth

□ 1856

Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. RANGEL changed his vote from “present” to “aye.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

### GI BILL TUITION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 357) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the educational assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—390

Aderholt  
Amash  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)

Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)

Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney

Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hall

Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Marchant  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows

Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Negrete McLeod  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires

Slaughter	Titus	Weber (TX)
Smith (MO)	Tonko	Weber (FL)
Smith (NE)	Turner	Welch
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wenstrup
Smith (TX)	Valadao	Westmoreland
Southerland	Van Hollen	Whitfield
Stewart	Vargas	Williams
Stivers	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Stutzman	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez	Wittman
Takano	Visclosky	Wolf
Terry	Wagner	Womack
Thompson (CA)	Walberg	Woodall
Thompson (MS)	Walden	Yoder
Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Yoho
Thornberry	Walz	Young (AK)
Tierney	Waters	Young (IN)
Tipton	Waxman	

## NOT VOTING—41

Amodei	Gutiérrez	Runyan
Andrews	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Bishop (NY)	Kingston	Sanford
Buchanan	Loeb sack	Scalise
Campbell	Lynch	Schwartz
Cassidy	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Marino	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
DeSantis	Meeks	Stockman
Fincher	Meng	Tiberi
Garrett	Miller, Gary	Tsongas
Gerlach	Moran	Wasserman
Gibson	Richmond	Schultz
Gosar	Rogers (AL)	Yarmuth

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the educational assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, to make other improvements in the laws relating to benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3590, SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-339) on the resolution (H. Res. 470) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### JOE'S STONE CRAB

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, to the sound of cracking claws, Joe's Stone Crab, a famous, and especially delicious, South Beach institution has

made its debut here in the Nation's Capital.

Over 100 years ago, in 1913, Joe and Jennie Weiss started a lunch stand on Miami Beach that has become a south Florida icon, as recognizable as South Beach, Little Havana, or the Everglades.

Many families view the opportunity to dig into a plate of Joe's stone crabs as a special treat, especially because they have to save up their money for a while in order to get to Joe's.

South Floridians are proud to support Joe's because even after 100 years, it is still a family-owned business, one that treats their nearly 400 employees like they are part of that family.

So, to all of my congressional colleagues, if you cannot make it down to my sunny and warm Miami congressional district to try these delicious stone crabs, at least you have the opportunity to get a taste of what you are missing in our tropical paradise through a brand new Joe's in downtown D.C. Come and enjoy what south Florida has to offer.

#### THE SEATTLE SEAHAWKS WIN SUPER BOWL XLVIII

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the Seattle tradition I would like to rise and recognize the football game that was played last night in New Jersey. Our team played very well, and no one in Seattle was the least bit surprised at the result.

#### MILITARY SUICIDES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to welcome encouraging news from the Army on a problem our military has faced for over a decade, the increase of suicides.

It was announced today that, for the first time since 2004, suicides in the Army have decreased. In 2013, there were 150 suicides in the Active Duty Army, down 19 percent from the 185 in 2012. This is great news, but it is just a first step and a lot more must be done.

Mr. Speaker, even one soldier taking his or her own life is a tragedy, but 150 is still an epidemic, especially where one in five were never deployed. That number increases further if you include the Guard, Reserves, and other services. Not only must Congress do more to address this issue, this country needs to focus more on the overarching issue of mental health.

As this Congress moves forward, I will continue to work on this issue and intend to introduce legislation again dealing with mental health assessments during initial enlistments.

We must keep faith in the promise to take care of these individuals who stepped forward to serve our Nation.

#### FEDERAL PRISON POPULATIONS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the United States Attorney General, Eric Holder, and President Obama for joining with voices, particularly those of the House Judiciary Committee, Republicans and Democrats, and acknowledging that the United States is comprised of only 5 percent of the world's population, but we incarcerate almost a quarter of the world's prisoners.

While the entire U.S. population has increased about one-third over the last 30 years, the Federal prison population has increased at a staggering rate of 800 percent, currently totaling nearly 216,000 inmates and currently operates at a 33 percent overcapacity.

One-half of those Federal prison populations are drug offenses. While some of them are truly dangerous persons, as Deputy Attorney General Cole said, many of them are first-timers, and by possession only, wound up under Federal laws, the crack cocaine laws, in the Federal system.

Today, I stand to support the clemency offering that is being offered by the Department of Justice, as well as to reduce barriers in housing and access to health care.

I ask my colleagues to join me in working to ensure that we get word out to these individuals and their families to make sure that this clemency works and works in the right way, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1915

#### PRESIDENT WRONG ON MARIJUANA

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently, President Obama said that marijuana is no more dangerous than alcohol; however, the White House's own Web site gives numerous examples to the contrary:

First, marijuana use, particularly chronic use that begins at a young age, can lead to negative health consequences, such as dependence, addiction, respiratory illnesses, and cognitive impairment;

Second, marijuana is not a benign drug, and it is the second-leading substance for which people receive drug treatment;

Third, in the past 20 years, marijuana potency has tripled, leading to serious public health concerns;

Fourth, long-term use, particularly in adolescents, may be linked with lower IQ later in life.

Mr. Speaker, comparing marijuana to alcohol, as the President did, will only encourage its use and endanger the health of many Americans.

## CASTROVILLE

(Mr. GALLEGGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGGO. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to highlight parts of the 23rd District, I rise today to talk about one of the jewels of the 23rd, Castroville, where Texas meets France. One of several settlements founded by Henri Castro in 1844, the Alsatian culture there is still evident. And most people don't know that it was the first county seat of Medina County, serving until 1893.

The population in the 2010 census was only 2,680 people. It is a small town very near a big city, 25 miles west of San Antonio. There are 97 historical buildings in the town. It is a great place for a walking tour.

And if you are looking for recreational relaxation, there are few places better than Castroville, where the Medina River meanders through town. The Medina River was once the border between Texas and Mexico. There are 126 acres of pecan trees and flowers along the Medina River in the Castroville Regional Park and lots and lots of shopping. Castroville Pottery is one of the coolest pottery shops around, where they will show you how to make your own.

Mr. Speaker, around the 23rd District in 1 minute.

## OBAMACARE CONTINUES TO HURT SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I hosted a town hall by telephone with constituents to hear their expectations for the President's State of the Union address. The overwhelming message was clear: we must repeal and replace the government health care takeover bill, which destroys jobs.

During the call, I spoke with Annette, a small business owner from Columbia who would like to expand her company and hire more employees. Unfortunately, because of the tax increases imposed by ObamaCare, Annette feels as though the government is single-handedly prohibiting her from creating new jobs.

Annette is not alone. Today, Federal employees received their February pay statements, and one dedicated employee showed me her premium had doubled, putting her family in crisis.

House Republicans have an alternative that repeals the unworkable health care law and replaces it with commonsense solutions that will not deter Annette and millions of other small business owners from creating jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

## YOU CAN'T MAKE THIS STUFF UP

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency announced that it is expanding the boundary lines of Wyoming's Wind River Indian Reservation so that it now includes three towns: Kinnear, Riverton, and Pavillion. This decision by the EPA, claiming it had authority under the Clean Air Act, overturned earlier congressional actions that reduced the size of Wind River Indian Reservation and made clear that the neighboring towns were not a part of this reservation.

In a January 6 press release, Wyoming Governor Matt Mead is quoted as having said:

My deep concern is about an administrative agency of the Federal Government altering a State's boundary and going against over 100 years of history and law. This should be a concern to all citizens because, if the EPA can unilaterally take land away from a State, where will it stop?

Where will it stop, indeed. I believe the EPA thinks that it controls anything that touches air or water. They even think they control the boundaries of the Indian nations. You can't make this stuff up.

## ISSUES FACING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker for allowing me this 1 hour to talk on some very important subjects that are facing the Nation. We deal with economic issues. We deal with the health care crisis in our country. And Americans right now, as they are watching us on this floor this evening, wonder if they will have a job tomorrow. So many Americans right now are looking at part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs. This is changing their lives, and it is changing what they thought the future would hold for them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the American people that it is not over. Hold on. We know that better days could be ahead. Why? Because economics can change; economic policies can change. And unfortunately, what we have seen coming out of the Obama White House, the economic policies have led to Americans not having the number of hours that they need to be able to provide for their families. They haven't led to the wage increases that they had hoped that they would be able to see.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, very disturbing information has come forward that nearly \$4,000 in a reduction of income has occurred, on average, to American households. From the

time President Obama first came into office in 2008, the average median household income was something like almost \$4,000 more in 2007 than it is today in 2014.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how anyone could see that that is good news or that that is a good deal because with inflation and inflationary values—we all know, Mr. Speaker, that people pay more for gasoline today in 2014 than they did back in 2007. We know that people pay far more today for groceries, Mr. Speaker, in 2014 than they did in 2007. So what the American people need is relief, relief from these inflation-pushed high prices on the American people.

That is why the report that came out on Friday regarding the Keystone pipeline was so important. It confirmed what numerous other studies had already told us before, and it is this:

The Keystone pipeline will not increase carbon emissions here in the United States. It is completely safe. And for the good of the United States of America, for the good of our environment, for the good of job creation, for the good of wage increases in the United States, we should have built Keystone and the pipeline and increased American energy production years ago.

We have the chance now. And so, Mr. Speaker, I call on the Obama administration to implement what the recent State Department report issued on Friday, and it is this: that we can safely go ahead and build the Keystone pipeline.

But I think we need to go much further than that, Mr. Speaker. I think that it would behoove not only this House of Representatives but also the United States Senate and the President of the United States to unify and agree on something that would be so good for all Americans—young and old, rich and poor, Black and White, Latinos—all elements of the United States. We should unite on growing our economy and growing prosperity for the average American. And we can do this, Mr. Speaker, by engaging in an all-of-the-above energy policy whereby we legalize all forms of energy and, in fact, encourage exploration and growth, because we have reports that are issued every single year that come to the same conclusion year after year after year: of all the countries in the world—there are well over 100 countries in the world, and of all the countries in the world, our own government tells us every year in a report that it is the United States of America that has been singularly blessed.

Blessed how, Mr. Speaker? Blessed with an abundance of natural energy resources. Whether it is oil—the United States is blessed with more oil than Saudi Arabia—or whether it is natural gas—the United States of America is blessed with trillions of cubic square feet of natural gas—every day, Mr. Speaker, our scientists and our explorers find more and more of these wonderful natural resources: oil, natural

gas, and coal. And because of the genius of the scientists in the United States, we have cleaner options than ever before to use this fundamental source of energy which is the number one source of energy in the United States, and that is coal.

In my home State of Minnesota, we see that there is a propane crisis. The people in my district are severely curtailed from using this energy resource. And there is also a scarcity of the product as well. I spoke with one individual today on the plane when I was coming in who told me that he was so happy. His mother locked in at about \$1.30 a gallon on propane, and he said there are reports propane could go up to over \$6 a gallon, perhaps even \$7, before the harshest winter in decades in Minnesota and other parts of America, as well, is over.

Let's help the American people's lives, Mr. Speaker. Let's not make life more difficult for the average American. Let's make life better. And we can do that very simply by engaging in an all-of-the-above American energy strategy, whereby, literally millions of high-paying jobs would come online.

Since President Obama came into office, we have seen the average median household income go down, not freeze or stay the same, but actually go down, go down by nearly \$4,000. And, in fact, the average median income of the average American, they now see that their income is 8 percent less today than it was 7 years ago. Rather than that being our story, let's change the narrative, Mr. Speaker. Let's change it for a positive, happy ending for the American people so that when they go to their local gas stations, rather than gas being in excess of \$3 a gallon or in some parts of this country over \$4 a gallon, let's bring that price down, Mr. Speaker, so that it could be \$2 a gallon again. I know that is entirely possible and within our grasp.

But what would be even better is to see the average American's income, including senior citizens on fixed income, to see their incomes go up—their rate of return on their savings, the rate of return on their dividends, their investments that they have tied up, after a lifetime of labor, after a lifetime of doing the right thing, taking their hard-earned money, putting it into savings, putting it into investments, putting it into, for many Americans what is their number one investment, which is their home, seeing Americans' home values rise. Why? Because of having a go-go economy, a growth-based economy, an economy that is growing because, rather than being a consumer of energy from foreign nations, we are, instead, the world's leading supplier of energy resources across the rest of the world.

I know this is possible, Mr. Speaker, and I know that we can unify on this issue—not only fossil fuels but also nuclear reactors.

□ 1930

Just this last week, I spoke with an individual who is an expert in the field of nuclear reactors. Before, in the United States, we relied on large nuclear reactors. In my home State of Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, we have two nuclear reactors in my State that supply somewhere between 20 and 25 percent of all the electricity needs in Minnesota. We are grateful that we have these two reactors that provide emission-free power in our State, but we have a new generation of nuclear reactors that could come online and be available for people all across the United States. Think, in a rural area, where perhaps it is just a few thousand people who perhaps wouldn't have access to nuclear-generated energy, they could have access to new, small, nuclear modules that are effectively able to be put in very unique locations, completely safe, almost—almost—waste-free.

This new generation of nuclear reactors, in my opinion, should be studied and put online in the near future so that we could have yet one more tool in America's energy toolkit. As a matter of fact, the United States could be, again, the leading supplier of this newest generation of modular nuclear reactors to be used and deployed across the world where they are safe, where they can't be compromised, and where very, very little nuclear waste comes forward.

You see, it is exciting, Mr. Speaker, to look at the future when so many of my constituents that I speak to today are worried and nervous about the future. They literally tell me, Congresswoman, I have no idea if my children will be as well off in their future as I am today. Every generation of Americans has been hopeful and optimistic, Mr. Speaker, because they have assumed and taken for granted that their children would be better off economically than they are today. That is all of our hope. I know I feel that for my biological children, and that is my hope and my prayer for our foster children. We want every generation to not only have what we had but to exceed it and shoot for the stars with their ambition, their goals, their dreams and their plans. Isn't that America? Isn't that what defines us, to build the next generation of the next mousetrap, to benefit not only us, not only our children, but to benefit and lift up those among us in the United States who seek to move up the next economic ladder?

You see, that is what can happen with innovation. Pull out a smartphone, if you have a smartphone, and you think of what was available to only the wealthiest among us, you now see in the hands of people at the bottom level of the economic ladder. Yet how much improved are our lives because we have smartphones today that are available to us? Think of the applications, the apps, if you will, that are on smartphones, and how those apps

can be used to increase productivity in the United States, can be used, for instance, on health care to connect us more quickly with a doctor or a nurse or a pharmacy so we can realize the requirements that we need to become healthier individuals.

There are so many great innovations that are just waiting around the corner if we only legalize them, if we only open them up, and if we reject this very heavy hand of government that wants to bureaucratize nearly every element of our lives and cause different aspects of our lives to be far more expensive and have less of an ability to access the newest innovations. Instead, we in the United States need to be what we were for the first several hundred years of our existence, and it is this: nimble—nimble and able to capitalize on the intellect, the raw ideas and the talents that are in the United States. Legal immigration has benefited this country immeasurably, and we embrace with both arms legal immigration and all that has meant for our country. These are just a few of the things that we have to be hopeful about and optimistic about as we go forward in our country.

There are other issues, as well, besides economics, that we grapple with here in the United States. One of those deals with foreign policy, another deals with national security, and another deals with how the United States is viewed across the world. I have spent time with my colleagues, many of whom this last week were across the world trying to meet with world leaders and find out what the concerns are and how we in the United States can advance our mutual interests.

I was privileged to be able to go on a fact-finding trip recently with one of my Democrat colleagues, a wonderful man from Rhode Island, Representative JIM LANGEVIN. JIM is a quadriplegic, and he and I had the privilege of traveling both to Australia and to New Zealand, where we met with our counterparts and also where we could talk about mutual areas where we could work together.

We see the rise in Asia of a new and aggressive China, a China who, for all practical purposes, has been engaging in what some would call cyber espionage and cyber warfare against nations all across the world—not just the United States but against many nations. How can we cooperate, then, with our allies to counter very aggressive steps that could be taken by, for instance, the Chinese or perhaps the Russians or perhaps the Iranians or other nations, North Korea, for instance, who may not have the United States' best interest at heart, who may, in fact, through the use of the Internet, through cyber espionage or through hacking in government computers, be, in essence, stealing some of the United States' most sensitive secrets, secrets that we would not want our adversaries to have? This is a very real issue, Mr. Speaker, and one that needs to be addressed.



That isn't the only form of warfare. There is also economic warfare, where our private businesses, through their own expenditure of funds on research and development, have come up with innovative new products and have, in effect, had the plans, the designs and the processes for those products literally stolen by adversaries—again not with our best interest at heart here in the United States. That information has been taken, and in some cases, we are told, a country like China has built a factory in China or in some other location where all they had to do was steal the raw data from an American company and they could go to work once they had that intellectual property and put to work perhaps a new line of paint, perhaps a new product that was being made in the United States and now is being made more cheaply in China and is undercutting the patents, the protections and the intellectual property that we have in the United States.

Do you see, Mr. Speaker, it is a brave new world that we live in. That is why national security matters, and it is why foreign policy matters. It is why this last weekend at the Munich conference it was very important that we in the United States listened to and paid attention to what it was we were hearing from our foreign partners in the world. We have to recognize the reality of our world. Not everyone has America's best interest at heart. Not all foreign powers want to make sure that it is America's children who will grow up to be the economic and military powerhouse leaders of the world.

You see, many foreign nations would like to see the United States cut down, reduced down, so that we are no longer an economic leader or a military leader. I believe that the United States has been a strong partner in keeping peace across the world for decades. We are not a perfect country. We haven't done everything right. We get that. We recognize that. But I believe that our world has been better off when the United States has been that economic leader and that military leader.

If the United States isn't the leader in the world, who should be? What would peace be like in the world if Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government were the leader holding together world powers? Just imagine for a moment what that would be like. Or imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would it be like if China was the leader holding together world powers? We know what they have done before. By stealing secrets from our government and stealing secrets from private industry, we know what that has done. What would that be like if China was the leading military or economic superpower?

We can't think that this is some far-off future scenario that could never happen. We need to open our eyes, and I think one place that we can open our eyes is listening to what foreign leaders are telling us. What some of my colleagues have told me even as re-

cently as today from some of their travels, foreign travels across the world, is that they have never heard before foreign leaders say to them what they are saying now. Foreign leaders are saying, look, we don't get the United States anymore. We don't understand your foreign policy. We don't understand your national security, because we don't understand who the friends of the United States are anymore. We don't understand who your adversaries are anymore. In fact, we can receive communications from the State Department or the Defense Department or an intelligence department, and we can get three different pictures of the same scenario. Which one should we believe?

There is a problem—and we didn't hear this just once. We have heard this from multiple regions in the world and from multiple world leaders who were scratching their heads, even including former Polish President Lech Walesa, who had said the United States is no longer the political and moral power in the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, other nations across the world want the United States, a responsible holder of power, to maintain that sense of decency and rule of law and adherence to a common goal of mankind, to prefer peace over war. Sometimes the United States has had to go to war. We have had to go to war in order to stand face to face and toe to toe with some of the most maniacal dictators that have ever been known in human history. That would include a Stalin of Russia, that would include a Mao Tse-tung of China, and that would include an Adolf Hitler of Germany. These maniacal rulers have served to hurt the chances for peace in the world, and yet it is the United States that has chosen to put on the line treasure and blood time after time after time. Once war has ensued—no one wants war, no one prefers war—but once that has ensued, it is the United States through the Marshall Plan that did, in fact, rebuild Europe and feed millions who were starving. It was the United States after World War II, after dropping the bombs in Japan, that went in and helped to rebuild that war-torn country and the difficulty that had ensued.

These aren't easy issues. There is no clean line here of right and wrong. There are difficulties that we grapple with. We get that. But, Mr. Speaker, one thing that we should agree on is that the policies of the United States shouldn't hurt the American people, and they shouldn't hurt people in other countries. Our policies should be ones that help the American people and help to bring about peace with other nations of the world. That should be easy.

That is why this last weekend at the Munich conference I was particularly concerned with our Secretary of State's comments. There was an article that had come out just this weekend regarding our Secretary of State, and I wanted to quote from it. I wanted to be

able to speak a little bit, also, about some other issues that have been in the news. The American people continue to ask me about Benghazi: When are we ever going to get the truth about Benghazi? Just over a week ago, there was an article by the second-in-command in Benghazi who wanted to straighten up the facts and put his view on paper.

That is all very interesting. We want to be able to have time to talk about that, but I think it is also very important that we talk about and listen to America's greatest ally in the world. There is an ally that felt very disrespected and even used the word "offended" after comments that were made at the Munich conference this week by our Secretary of State. Now, in deference to our Secretary of State, followup responses have been that he didn't mean to say what was reported in the media, but I think it is very important that we look at our ally—and this is Israel—and what Israel's response is. Again, I think, Mr. Speaker, we need to look at the context of the remarks that were made by our Secretary of State. Because, you see, if you speak with the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, as I have done numerous times in the last few months, and if you speak to the Foreign Minister of Israel, as I have been privileged to do, to the defense secretary in Israel, as I have been privileged to do, and to the intelligence secretary in Israel, as I have been privileged to do, they have been very strong and united in their view of the greatest existential threat that Israel faces today.

□ 1945

That threat isn't new; it is one that Israel has faced for the last recent years. And it is this: it is Iran with a nuclear weapon, because Iran has stated unequivocally, once they gain access to a nuclear weapon, and potentially the missile means to deliver that weapon, they have announced they will use that weapon against Israel. They will use that weapon against Israel, Israel being about the size of New Jersey. The largest city, Tel Aviv, and the surrounding area provides employment to approximately 80 percent of the Israeli population. So it doesn't take a lot of imagination, Mr. Speaker, to see that it may be the game plan of a nuclear weaponized Iran to drop a nuclear weapon on Tel Aviv and effectively wipe out the Jewish State of Israel in one fell swoop.

If that would happen, we should not kid ourselves, that capability and capacity, I believe, could just as easily be used against our Western partners and allies in the European region. It could be used against Australia, our great ally and friend, and also against New Zealand, our great ally and friend. And it could even be used here in the United States of America.

The rhetoric that has come out of Iran is nothing less than outrageous,

but intentional. The regime has stated, they haven't deviated one iota from their nuclear goals and ambitions—not one iota.

What would that mean for the world if Iran obtained a nuclear weapon? You see, this is a very dangerous, dangerous game that we are playing with Iran.

I absolutely disagree fundamentally with the President's decision under the P5+1 agreement to allow Iran to continue to spin centrifuges and continue to enrich uranium which could be used as a fuel for a nuclear weapon. Iran has not complied with the U.N. resolutions, not at all. They have not.

What is different today under the P5+1? Not much, I would submit. So the worst nightmare for Israel has been realized in that exactly when Iran was being squeezed with economic sanctions, when they were in a position where they were starting to yell “ouch,” that is exactly when the United States and the P5+1 pulled back the pressure and allowed Iran to have some breathing space, breathing space to the tune of billions of dollars of access to grow and prop up Iran's failing economy. This was not the time to give balance to Iran. This was the time to demand cooperation from Iran.

And so what is happening now is that we see people from all over the world—China, Russia, various nations—are all buying plane tickets to run to Iran to conduct economic deals because, you see, under the previous sanction's regime, nations were prevented from constructing economic deals because it would help build up Iran. Now, it is an open-court press to engage in economic commerce with Iran. That is building up Iran, and it is causing Iran to have less incentive to come to the table and stop their program of enriching uranium, of spinning centrifuges, and they are not in any way dismantling their current nuclear program.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said, it is his worst day in 10 years. He said this is the deal of the century for Iran.

Why is it we would fail to listen to our number one ally in the world, Israel, on this topic of a nuclear weaponized Iran? Why wouldn't we listen to their concerns? Why—Israel, which is far more vulnerable to Iran with a nuclear weapon—wouldn't we take those concerns into account?

Well, I think it is revealing what happened this last weekend at the Munich conference because you see, Mr. Speaker, one government minister in Israel called Secretary of State Kerry's statements “offensive.” At the conference the Secretary said, and I quote from the article that was published this weekend:

You see, for Israel, there is an increasing delegitimization campaign that has been building up.

In other words, there is an effort to delegitimize Israel. People are very sensitive to it. There are talks of boycotts and other kinds of things. Are we all going to be better off with all of that? The Intelligence Minister,

Steinitz, in Israel yesterday morning said:

Israel cannot be pressured to negotiate with a gun against its head.

In other words, economic boycotts from the European Union, from sanctions, and also from divestment campaigns.

Now, let's just think about this for a moment. Boycotts, boycotting Israel's products. Approximately 30 percent, I am told, of economic trade that Israel engages in comes from Europe. If there is a boycott that comes from the EU, this will severely handicap Israel's economy, and yet it seems Secretary of State Kerry was threatening Israel with an economic boycott.

What about sanctions? Sanctions. Isn't it the mother of all ironies that sanctions, by agreement of the United States, have been lifted from what arguably is the United States' greatest adversary, a nuclear weaponized Iran, and also Israel's greatest adversary, a nuclear weaponized Iran? We would lift sanctions, ironically, against a rogue regime with announced intentions to annihilate people across the world, the Jewish State of Israel, the United States of America; the Jewish State of Israel being the little Satan and the United States of America being denominated the great Satan. So we would lift sanctions on this maniacal nation, a nuclear Iran, and yet we would threaten sanctions or the possibility of sanctions from the EU against America's greatest ally, Israel? Isn't that one of the most severe ironies of all time? This being the greatest existential threat to the world, Iran with a nuclear weapon. How could it be that our Secretary of State could bring this up to the world at the Munich conference this last weekend, the specter of a boycott against Israel, sanctions against Israel, and the potential of a divestment campaign analogous to South Africa which actually engaged in apartheid.

And yet in Israel, what is the so-called apartheid when the Palestinians can work in the State of Israel? Palestinians are allowed to live in the Jewish State of Israel. There is an effort of coexistence from the Jewish State of Israel. And yet what has the Palestinian Authority done? They have thumbed their nose at the Oslo Accord. They have thumbed their nose. Have they fulfilled the requirements on the Palestinians? No, they have not.

What did Israel do? Israel took land in the Gaza area, which is on the Mediterranean Sea. They withdrew Israeli settlers from Gaza and gave the land over to the Palestinian Authority in exchange for peace. What sort of peace did Israel realize by actually giving up that land to the Palestinian Authority? They were met with rockets fired in the region near Beersheba and Sderot. Those areas continue to have thousands of rockets pointed at them.

Who, I ask, Mr. Speaker, is the aggressor in this situation? Who, I ask, Mr. Speaker, should be the one to re-

ceive economic boycotts or sanctions or divestment? Would it be Israel, which is not being the aggressor with rockets against Gaza, or should it be Gaza?

You see, these rockets are hidden in neighborhoods. They are hidden in nursing homes by the Palestinians. They are hidden in areas where civilians are kept. And these rockets are not fired at military targets, Mr. Speaker, by the Palestinians. They are specifically targeted at elementary schools, at nursing homes in Israel, and at innocent human life. Think of this.

And our Secretary of State this weekend, in effect, threatened Israel with boycotts, economic sanctions, and divestment. No wonder the Israelis were so extremely upset with our Secretary of State. Even the economic minister, Naftali Bennett, whom I had the privilege of meeting on one of my recent trips, had a message for all of the advice givers:

Never has a nation abandoned their land because of economic threats. We are no different.

In other words, be warned, Israel will not give up further land no matter what the threats are. And the United States, which purports to be Israel's best friend, should not be the one rattling the saber with economic threats.

Naftali Bennett went on to say:

Only security will ensure economic stability, not a terrorist state next to Ben Gurion Airport. We expect our friends around the world to stand beside us and against anti-Semitic efforts targeting Israel, and not for them to be their amplifier.

That is how those words were received in this very volatile part of the world. Even Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu weighed in on our Secretary of State's boycott threats, primarily coming from Europe, during his Cabinet meeting. According to a transcript of the Prime Minister's remarks on the Prime Minister's Web site, he called any attempts to boycott Israel “immoral and unjust.”

“They will not achieve their goal,” the Prime Minister said. “First, they cause the Palestinians to adhere to their intransigent positions, and thus push peace further away.”

You see, these are not big asks for reasonable people to consider. You see, the Palestinian Authority is being asked to recognize the right to exist for the Jewish State of Israel—the right to exist. They don't even want to accept that the Jewish State of Israel has the right to exist. That is number one. Number two, does the Jewish State of Israel have the right to defend herself from aggression? They won't even admit that she has the right to defend herself from aggression.

Maybe it would help if Hamas, which is the ruling authority over Gaza, maybe it would help if they remove article 7 from their charter, which calls for the annihilation of the Jewish people, the extermination of the Jewish people. There isn't much difference between the call in the Hamas charter,

which is the final solution, the eradication of the Jewish people in the Jewish State of Israel, there isn't much difference between that and what a maniacal leader tried to accomplish during World War II. And yet these same terrorists are being given deference in the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations.

It is bizarre to think that the United States and the policy of the United States since 2008 has included calling on Israel to retreat and give up even more land to the Palestinians, which have repeatedly called for the annihilation of the Jewish state. It is amazing that the United States and our President has called on Israel to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders, which would be a suicide mission.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I have been to Israel. I have literally stood in an apartment building where I can look out the front window of the apartment and see the Mediterranean Sea and the border of Israel on the west, and look out the window in the rear of the apartment and see Israel's border on the east with the Golan Heights, about a 9-mile width.

□ 2000

What country could defend itself, especially when the call is that the Palestinian Authority seeks to unite both the area of Judea and Samaria with Gaza, and they want a highway to do that? In other words, Israel is being called upon to cut herself in two. If she cuts herself in two, just like any human body, she couldn't go on, she couldn't survive, she couldn't live.

So these requests that are coming—in fact, those demands that are coming from the Palestinian Authority—should be shut down by the United States of America. That is where the delegitimization should come, Mr. Speaker, not delegitimizing Israel because she has a goal of the existence of the Jewish state. Shouldn't Israel have that right to continue and preserve itself as the Jewish State of Israel? Isn't that a worthy goal? Should we agree with that?

Why should we be undercutting that goal when the so-called partner in peace, the Palestinian Authority, is unwilling to even work with step one? I understand the response from leaders in Israel this weekend—I understand it—because, in effect, what they are saying is they no longer recognize the United States of America as its friend.

Isn't it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that parallels what many Members of Congress have been hearing from various leaders across the world: We no longer recognize the United States of America; we no longer recognize your foreign policy. Behind closed doors they are telling us they want us to succeed. They want us to remain the world's superpower because we provide literally defense across the world to keep world order. If we are not here as a force for good, then what, then who, then what is the next step? So you see these are not comments made by our ally Israel

and those leaders without cause and without reason.

The Prime Minister said: "They will not achieve their goal"—meaning the boycott and the sanctions and the divestment. "First, they cause the Palestinians to adhere to their intransigent positions and thus push peace further away." True. "Second, no pressure will cause me to concede the vital interests of the State of Israel, especially the security of Israel citizens."

Make no mistake about it: Israel won't give up, Israel is going to stand, Israel is going to be there. So the last nation to put roadblocks in Israel's way should be the United States of America.

Secretary Kerry has a proud record of over three decades of steadfast support for Israel's security.

That is the statement that was released. But the Secretary's words don't add up.

At the conference, Kerry said of the Israel-Palestinian conflict:

Today's status quo absolutely, to a certainty, I promise you 100 percent, cannot be maintained. It's not sustainable. It's illusory. There's a momentary prosperity, there's a momentary peace.

In other words, Secretary Kerry is putting pressure on Israel to make a change, and to make a change whereby putting her sovereignty on the line.

The question is: Will the United States continue to press Israel to withdraw from Judea and Samaria, the Biblical homeland of the Jewish State of Israel?

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why in the world would the United States ask Israel to withdraw from the very location where, according to Biblical and Torah documents, the Jewish State of Israel was begun; where Abraham, the originator of the Jewish State of Israel, where the Jewish people had their origin. Why would Judea and Samaria be that area that is the area that we would expect would be given back to the Palestinian Authority when there has been virtually continuous presence of the Jewish people in that region, albeit to varying degrees?

I had the privilege of standing at Shiloh—or what some people pronounce Shiloh—where the tent of meeting was moved in the interim period between the First Temple period and the Second Temple period on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. The temple was in a tent at Shiloh.

There are artifacts yet today being found, shards of pottery that prove that this location in Judea and Samaria was where the Jewish people had their most holy site, where the Holy of Holies, the Ark of the Covenant, was kept with the tents built around, where worship was conducted for over 350 years by the Jewish people. Yet the Jewish people are told they have to leave that land, the land of their origins, the land of worship for over 3,500 years—they have to leave? It is incredible, it is impossible, it will never be.

One thing that needs to be understood, Mr. Speaker, is the tenacity and

determination and decision of the Jewish people. You see, Mr. Speaker, they have given up before. They have given land for peace. They have given one concession after another. But what they have told me in my visits to Judea and Samaria, no more the people who live there are temporary settlers. They are residents, this is their home, and they have no intention of leaving, and they will fight to the death for their land and for their people and for their ancestors and forebears and, yes, for their children and for the future of the Jewish State of Israel.

You see the Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stood in this Chamber right behind me and stood, Mr. Speaker, at the lectern, and he told a joint session of Congress very clearly that Israel isn't what's wrong with the Middle East; Israel is what is right with the Middle East.

I know from experience. The very first time I was privileged to travel to the Jewish State of Israel was the day after I graduated from high school. It was in 1974. I spent my summer in Israel. It was a very different place back then. It was a Third World country. The modern State of Israel was established in 1948 under extremely severe adverse conditions, and they continued to fight for the maintenance of their sovereignty. Why? Because they were continually attacked by their Arab neighbors and continue to remain so to this day.

There is only one Jewish state in the world. There are multiple Arab nations, multiple Muslim nations across the world, as it should be. We recognize the right to exist of Muslim nations. We recognize Iran's right to exist.

Why is it that only the Jewish State of Israel has to struggle for the world to recognize its right to exist? Why is it the only nation in the world that has to struggle to have recognition of its designated capital—Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the eternal undivided city and the undivided capital of the Jewish State of Israel. Yet that appears, once again, to be the bone of contention for the world, Jerusalem. Even so much so that the United States, which is supposed to be Israel's ally and we are supposed to have Israel's back, our Embassy remains in Tel Aviv rather than in Jerusalem.

There are efforts to have our Embassy moved, and I call upon our government, Mr. Speaker, I call upon our President, to demonstrate to Israel that we do have your back, we are your greatest ally, and have the United States move our Embassy into Jerusalem and do it in a fortnight and make it happen and show the world that we literally do have their back.

If we can't do that, Mr. Speaker, I will call upon our administration to at minimum change the State Department's Web site, which, if you look at the map of Israel and if you look at the capital Jerusalem, Jerusalem is not designated Israel; it is considered an international up-for-grabs area. Really?

Jerusalem is contiguously surrounded by the Jewish State of Israel. How could this not be the very navel of the Jewish State of Israel? You see if the United States makes a decision to abandon Israel, as many nations of the world have done, as many nations are crying out for an economic boycott of Israel, economic sanctions against Israel, economic divestment against Israel, as though Israel were a criminal—if the United States, Mr. Speaker, chooses to join that extremely misguided, wrongheaded void of all facts, then I make a prediction, Mr. Speaker: that the United States will be adversely affected economically, and I believe that we could see adversity militarily against the United States as well.

There has always been one great defender of the Jewish state and of the Jewish people. That defender has been listed throughout antiquity, and Israel has had her back held by a force stronger than the United States. That strong right arm will remain for Israel. That defender will remain. The question is what will be the destiny of the United States? Will our destiny be one of blessing or will our destiny be one of adversity?

I think we need to be very clear and very careful in how we deal with the Jewish State of Israel. Israel must never be betrayed, and the United States must not put pressure on the Jewish State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go over just a brief timeline that I put together of Jewish and Israeli concessions and foreign demands that have been put on the Jewish State of Israel.

You can go back to 1917 with the Balfour Declaration.

Go back to 1920. There were Arab attacks on peaceful Jewish settlements in the northern part of the British-controlled Palestine, where seven Jews were killed. The British military administration urged the disbanding of the Zionist commission, created to assist the British authorities in giving effect to the Balfour Declaration, promising the upbuilding of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The British military administration was replaced by a League of Nations mandate. It was Israel that was betrayed.

In 1921, anti-Jewish riots occurred in Jaffa on the Mediterranean, orchestrated by the British-installed Mufti of Jerusalem by the head of the Muslim community. They took the lives of 43 Jews in that effort in 1921. The British temporarily suspended Jewish immigration into Israel.

In 1922, Britain removed all of Palestine east of the Jordan. Seventy-eight percent of Palestine was removed from the territory of the League of Nations mandate for Palestine and power transferred to Emir Abdullah, who established the Emirate, later called Transjordan.

In 1929, a campaign of false rumor and propaganda, orchestrated by the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj-Amin el-

Husseini, alleged that Jews demonstrated at the Western Wall to curse Mohammed. Never happened. That mosques had been attacked by Jews. Never happened. That others would soon be attacked. A massive anti-Jewish pogrom convulsed Palestine in which 133 Jews were murdered by Arab mobs. The British suppressed the assaults, they killed 110 Palestinian Arabs. The British Shaw Commission ignored evidence of the Mufti's orchestration of the violence and recommended reducing Jewish immigration, and blamed the Jews for the murderous violence against them.

In 1939, a commission that investigated the Arab Revolt recommend creating a Jewish state in 20 percent of the British Mandate, with 80 percent of the mandate to be placed under Arab control and incorporated into the Transjordan. The Arab world rejected that—in other words, the Palestinian homeland rejected it—and the Arab Revolt continued.

In 1939, the St. James Conference was attended by the Zionist and Palestinian Arab leadership. Again, the Arab parties refused to sit in the same room with the Zionist representatives. No solution was reached. A paper was written. Further Jewish immigration would have to be dependent upon Arab approval.

□ 2015

In 1947, the United Nations proposed partitioning the British mandate. The plan was accepted by the Zionist movement. It was rejected by all Arab parties. Again, 6,000 Jews—1 percent of the Israeli population—were killed in a war in May of 1948 when Israel declared herself the Jewish state. That was her entrée into statehood and sovereignty. Israel has fought for her sovereignty ever since and has been under attack by our Arab neighbors ever since.

In 1949, Arab belligerents other than Iraq signed an armistice agreement with Israel. All refused to recognize Israel. All refused to negotiate a solution to the Palestinian-Arab refugee problem created by the first Arab-Israeli war that was launched by the Arab States. The Arab war on Israel created 700,000 Palestinian-Arab refugees. Most were confined to Palestinian refugee camps in neighboring Arab States, and 50,000 remain alive today—only 50,000. The oft-heard figure of 4 or 5 million Palestinian refugees includes, contrary to any other refugee case in the world, not only the actual refugees but generations of their offspring. Today, we have refugees from the Syrian conflict. Only the current refugees are included, not multiple generations. This is not true with the Palestinians. The U.N. called on Resolution 194, calling for returning refugees between the context of an Israeli-Arab peace, and all Arabs opposed that resolution.

On and on we go, Mr. Speaker, to the present time, including the most recent demand by Secretary of State Kerry against the Israelis that the

Israelis had to release over 100 terrorists, many of whom were murderers, who had killed innocent Israelis, including an American citizen. The United States Government put pressure on the Israeli Government to release known murderous terrorists and thugs in exchange for—what?—other Israeli prisoners to be returned to Israel? No, Mr. Speaker. It was in return for the Palestinians to sit down at the negotiating table, and they did.

Once again, Israel disadvantaged herself and released murderous terrorists in order to get the Palestinian Authority to just come to the table. What has been the goal of the Palestinian Authority? Delay, wait, change the terms, move the goalpost, never getting to a point of actually coming to an agreement.

We have the instance in '47-'50 of Jews in Arab lands being told that they had to flee violence and persecution.

In 1956, Israel captured the Sinai and then later returned it to Egypt. In 1957, Israel withdrew from all of the Sinai. In '67, Egyptian demands were met, and that is when Israel returned that land to Egypt. 1973 was the Yom Kippur war. Egypt attacked Israel. Syria attacked Israel. Israel turned the tide with a miracle, and a ceasefire came about. In '79, Israel and Egypt signed a peace treaty with Egypt, and Israel dismantled 5,000 communities.

In 1993 were the Oslo Accords. To this day, they have not been met by the Palestinian partners. In 1994, Israel and the PLO signed the Gaza-Jericho Agreement. Again, the Palestinian Authority repudiated that agreement. In 1995, the Oslo II agreement was, again, repudiated. In 1997, Israel and the PA signed the Hebron agreement. Again, there was no peace, and it was undercut. In 1998, the Wye River Memorandum—undercut. In 1999, the Sharm el-Sheikh agreement—again, undercut.

In 2000–2001, with the Camp David negotiations, again, Israel came in good faith—again, undercut. In 2003, the Roadmap for peace did not call for terrorism-free Palestinian leadership, and terrorists remain in that leadership today. In 2005, as I said earlier, Israel withdrew unilaterally from Gaza and northern Samaria, and 8,000 rockets have attacked Israel in that time. In 2008, Israel made another peace offer to the PA that covered 94 percent of the West Bank. Again, it wasn't enough. The PA wouldn't accept the offer, and it made no counteroffer. You see, the PA is unwilling to say "yes."

That is why this last weekend was so important, Mr. Speaker, and why Secretary of State Kerry's words fell on incredulous ears. In spite of the nuclear agreement with Iran and now with the words that were said this last weekend, we need to make it unmistakable that I as a Member of Congress stand with Israel, as do my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

# CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: WHEN WOMEN SUCCEED, AMERICA SUCCEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to lead the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour on: "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds."

I am honored to serve as the co-guest anchor this evening with my colleague and classmate, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY. We realize the importance "when women succeed, America succeeds" has on our economic agenda. I would also like to thank my colleagues Congressman HORSFORD and Congressman JEFFRIES for their assistance in organizing this evening's Special Order hour.

Too many women across America are being left behind in today's economy. As the President so passionately stated in his House floor speech of the state of the Union on Tuesday, today, women make up about half of our workforce, but they still make 77 cents for every dollar a man earns. This is wrong—and in 2014, it is an embarrassment. It is important for me to note: for Black women, the pay gap is even larger. Black women on the average earn only 64 cents to every dollar a man earns.

The President implored Congress, the White House, the businesses from Wall Street to Main Street to come together and give every woman the opportunity she deserves, because, "when women succeed, America succeeds."

Mr. President, I couldn't agree more, and I thank you for adding this statement, this call to action, to your State of the Union.

Many Democrats invited women from across America to attend the State of the Union address or to watch it—women who are among long-term unemployed women who are making a difference in their community, like in my community, a lady by the name of Amelia Caldwell, from the west side, working as a home health aide, or to my guest Karen Morrison, working as an executive in health care. Both must balance the work life, and both understand that we must continue to mentor and provide resources to support women, resources such as health care, child care, equal pay, affordable college tuition, early childhood education, economic development opportunities, and more advocates. Why? Because, when women succeed, America succeeds.

We know that women have made and continue to make great strides, but there is more work to be done. We must provide women with economic security and opportunities that they deserve, that their families need.

I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus chairwoman, MARCIA FUDGE, for her leadership in making this a front-burner issue for the Congressional Black Caucus tonight.

Just think about it. Jeannette Rankin was the first woman elected to Congress in 1917, who stood before this body and said, I may be the first woman to be here, but I won't be the last. She was right. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm was the first Black woman to serve in this body, and was the first in our Nation as a female to run for President of the United States. Leader PELOSI was the highest ranking female elected to serve in American history and was the first female to serve as House Speaker.

America is a much better place because of their service, but there are still far too many women who are left behind. We can help rectify that by making sure that we advocate for women's rights—to have the right to vote, to have pay equity, pay leave, and access to quality child care. This evening, we will have the opportunity to hear many firsthand stories about women and the challenges that they face and how we can help overcome them.

Let me start by introducing my co-guest anchor, ROBIN KELLY, from the Second District of Illinois. Robin is no stranger to the challenges that women face in the workforce. As a former State legislator and administrator and scholar and now a congressional advocate for women, I proudly present the gentlelady from Illinois, and I yield to her.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman BEATTY.

I want to thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus who have joined us here tonight and who continue to fight and serve as the conscience of our Congress.

Mr. Speaker, "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds." It is a simple enough concept, yet it hasn't received the attention it deserves in the policy arena. As we reflect on moments like the fifth anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act—a bill that most of us would agree was long overdue—it is important that we keep in our minds and hearts the critical lesson of that important legislation, which is that it is unacceptable for pay discrimination to exist in our workforce, that workers who face discrimination have a right to claim compensation for the injustices they face, that regardless of gender, race, religion, or sexual identity, we all have a right to be justly compensated for our work, and most importantly, that it is beneficial to our economy, our families, and our children to pay fair wages to all of America's workers.

In that spirit, we must lift up the cause of an economic agenda for women and their families. As we look to grow our economy, let us keep in mind how women drive that growth.

Women are the breadwinners or co-breadwinners in nearly two-thirds of America's families. Women now outnumber men at every level of the higher education ladder. In 1964, only about 40 percent of women were enrolled in

any type of college. Today, that figure is 57 percent. There are, roughly, 3 million more women currently enrolled in college than men. Women-owned businesses, like those owned by Vicky Linko, Letty Velez, and Christie Hefner in Illinois, account for nearly \$3 trillion of the gross domestic product in the United States.

Women are vital to our economic future. Still, the facts on how far we need to go for women to truly achieve the American Dream are staggering.

One in three adult women is living in poverty or on the brink of it. One-quarter of single mothers spend more than half of their incomes on housing compared to one-tenth of single fathers. Of all single mothers, nearly two-thirds are working in low-wage retail, service or administrative jobs that offer little economic support to adequately provide for the needs of their families. Women make only 77 cents for every dollar a man makes—a pay gap that exists even the first year out of college and continues through a woman's life. If you are a woman of color, no matter what your education is, there is that gap, and the gap grows as your education increases. Wage disparities cost American women an estimated \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages over a lifetime.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congresswoman KELLY, for providing us with those necessary statistics so we have a better understanding of, when we move forward, how we need to deal with making a difference in the lives of those women.

Now I have the great honor to yield to the gentlelady from Ohio's 11th Congressional District. She is the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus. She is a leader, a lawyer, and an advocate for the people. She leads the largest delegation of the Congressional Black Caucus in its history. We stand 43 strong following her leadership. Please join me as I yield to the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

□ 2030

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so very much, and thank you for yielding.

I want to especially say this evening that as we talk about women, we are anchored tonight by two women, Congresswoman BEATTY, of course, from the great State of Ohio, and Congresswoman KELLY from Illinois. I have had a wonderful opportunity to meet these outstanding women, and I am so pleased that they are here this evening. I thank them again for leading this Special Order hour for the Congressional Black Caucus.

Today, members of the CBC raise our collective voices to advocate for a stronger economy by supporting and investing in working women across America.

My colleagues and I know improving the economic condition of families and communities across the country begins with strengthening the economic position of women, because when women succeed, America succeeds.

Last week, we marked the fifth anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the first piece of legislation signed by President Obama. As a result of this important legislation, women can more effectively take legal action against employers for gender-based pay discrepancies. While the Lilly Ledbetter Act helped provide a pathway for women to litigate pay discrimination, it does not address how we will invest in the economic future of working women in the United States.

Today, women comprise almost half of the American workforce. The country has come a long way in promoting equal rights and equal pay for women, but it is unacceptable that in 2014, women still make 77 cents on the dollar compared to their male counterparts.

In my home State of Ohio, women make approximately \$10,000 less than men each year, and in my district, the median wage for women is 86 percent of the median wage for men. According to the 2010 Census, in 40 percent of American households with children, women are the sole or primary providers, and over 30 percent of households headed by women are living in poverty.

African American and Latino women tend to feel wage discrepancy more acutely, receiving approximately 64 cents and 55 cents on the dollar, respectively, when compared to White, non-Hispanic males.

This inequality must not continue. The economic security of our Nation's children depends on women's access to fair pay. This Nation cannot afford to continue treating women unfairly or leave women behind if they expect to strengthen and grow our economy.

We can start to address this inequity by increasing the minimum wage. Almost two-thirds of workers earning the minimum wage are women. The minimum wage has not been sufficiently adjusted to reflect inflation. Increasing the minimum wage will help lift millions of women and children across the country out of poverty.

It is also necessary to establish policies that enable working mothers to earn a living wage and to take care of their families. This requires workplace protections for pregnant workers, paid family sick leave for emergencies, and affordable child care.

We cannot sit idle as half the population of our Nation lags behind. I look forward to voting in support of measures that break down economic barriers preventing women from reaching their full potential, because when women succeed, we all succeed.

Thank you.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE. Clearly, we can see that she is no stranger to advocating for women and for lifting women out of poverty and standing for them.

Earlier today, Congresswoman FUDGE had the opportunity to speak to thousands of women who are gathered here this week to advocate for the same agenda, women of the Delta Sigma

Theta sorority, where she served as the 21st president. She spoke to them because they, too, join us in understanding that when women succeed, America succeeds.

Now I would like to yield to the gentlelady from California's Third Congressional District, a woman who has a long history of standing up for people; a woman who understands when you talk about the statistics that we have heard tonight, and we will continue to hear tonight, about women living in poverty; a woman who only a few weeks ago, as we celebrated the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's war on poverty, led us in a press conference with his daughter. Standing with her were members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

I call her a champion of the people. I call her our warrior of the people.

Join me as I yield to the gentlelady from California, the Honorable BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank you, Congresswoman BEATTY, for those very humbling remarks, for your tremendous leadership, and for the work that you do each and every day not only for the people of your district but for the people and the women and the children and families in the entire country.

I just have to say that you have certainly hit the ground running here in Washington, D.C. I think you have because of your life's work in Ohio, and what you have done in Ohio as an elected official and how you have just charted the course for so many issues for so many women. Thank you for leading us tonight.

Also, Congresswoman KELLY, I want to thank you for organizing this Special Order and also for being such a champion for women and children and your district in Illinois.

Again, I have been here now for probably eight terms. You all have just arrived. I just want to thank you. It is really an honor to work with you.

Congresswoman BEATTY, you earlier mentioned the President's quote. I want to mention once again what he said during the State of the Union because I think it is important to make sure that the country continues to hear that the President understands when women succeed, America succeeds, and he is leading the charge in the White House for that, in terms of his leadership.

Today, women make up about half of our workforce, but they still make 77 cents for every dollar a man earns. That is wrong, and in 2014, it is embarrassing.

So thank you again, Congresswoman BEATTY, for reiterating the President's quote, because we can't forget that he truly is supportive of our overall agenda.

It is simply unacceptable that women are still being paid 77 cents for every dollar that a man makes. African American and Latina women are being paid even less, at 64 cents and 50 cents, while doing the same work as men.

That is why our Democratic women of the House, under the leadership of Congresswomen NANCY PELOSI, DONNA EDWARDS, and DORIS MATSUI, along with all of us, have launched the "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds" campaign.

In drawing attention to the need for a true economic agenda for women and families in D.C., we all have been hosting a series of events in our districts across the country, and we are hearing the same thing. Congresswomen KELLY and BEATTY, myself, Congresswoman FUDGE from Ohio, are all hearing the same thing.

Saturday, I was really thrilled and honored to have been joined by Leader PELOSI at my event in Oakland. I was also joined by former Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, who so courageously told her story as a former public assistance recipient needing affordable child care and a good-paying job as a bridge over her troubled waters.

Also at this event I was joined by two of my constituents, Clarissa and Irma, who shared their struggle of trying to take care of their family.

Clarissa told us about her struggle as a single parent. When budget cuts caused her to lose the subsidy that she received to pay for child care, she was forced to pull her son, Xavier, out of preschool and resign from her job to care for him during the day. Xavier started kindergarten unprepared and is now in his second year, catching up with his peers. It is very difficult.

Clarissa is an unbelievable mother. So Xavier is going to make it, and he is going to be a true leader because of Clarissa, who is working each and every day to make sure he catches up. This didn't need to happen if she had affordable child care.

Also, it reminded me of when I was in college with my two sons. I always say they were the two best educated children under 3 years of age. They were college-educated under 3 years because I had to take them to class with me while a student at Mills College because I could not afford child care.

Child care is so critical to the success of women. When women succeed, America succeeds.

Let me tell you about Irma. She is a single mother and a restaurant worker, a low-wage worker. She shared her experience with pregnancy discrimination. There was not a dry eye in the room.

Irma, like so many women, became pregnant, and her manager reduced her work hours from 40 hours a week to less than 30 hours a week. He assigned her difficult tasks. You know why he did? To try to get her to resign. They had her doing work that she would never be allowed to do if her doctor had known that they were requiring her to do that.

After assigning her a particularly difficult task when she was 8 months pregnant, Congresswomen BEATTY and KELLY, do you know what her manager told her? He said, Well, if it's so hard, then why go to work? Why go to work?



So Irma's story is the story of so many of our constituents.

It also reminded me, as my colleagues have mentioned, of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman elected to Congress. She was fighting when she was here in Congress for pay equity for domestic women. She was fighting for affordable child care and for education.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus. She was someone that many of us looked up to. Her passion for the plight of working poor and women was undeniable.

Leader PELOSI and myself unveiled the Shirley Chisholm Black History stamp on Saturday during our panel discussion. It was just an amazing moment because of all the people in that room. There were 500 of my constituents; young people, middle age, old people. My 89-year-old mother and my two sisters were there. People really understood when women succeed, America succeeds, and the fight that Shirley Chisholm mounted for that.

In Brooklyn, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE serves in the spirit of Shirley Chisholm. She and Congressmen JEFFRIES, RANGEL, MEEKS, and KELLY had the privilege to unveil Shirley Chisholm's stamp in Brooklyn.

Once again, the message of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm that when women succeed, America succeeds, is so relevant and so current today. So the principles of our women's economic agenda which we are discussing tonight resonates throughout our country, like raising the minimum wage. I just have to reference low-wage workers. The majority are women and women of color.

Also, affordable, quality child care and paid family medical leave. Again, I mentioned my mother, a phenomenal woman who raised three young girls. Paid family medical care for not only our children but our elders, our senior citizens. It is so important that people know that they can care for their family members during their golden years, as well as their children.

Pay equity and closing the gap in terms of the statistics we cited earlier. All of these efforts that we are mounting here in Congress, hopefully we will have bipartisan support for raising the minimum wage in this overall agenda.

All of this means that when women succeed, America succeeds. The success of women is truly central and integral to the success of our country as a great democracy which stands for liberty and justice for all.

So thank you again, Congresswomen BEATTY and KELLY, for organizing this tonight.

I have to close by just saying Congressman Shirley Chisholm was a true Delta woman. She was the epitome of a Delta woman, and so this week, once again, saluting Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm and our overall women's agenda is so timely and so profound. Thank you again for this moment.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congresswoman LEE, and so timely are your words.

Talking about Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm reminds me of a quote of hers that I read. It said:

Tremendous amounts of talent are lost to our society just because that talent wears a skirt.

Certainly, like you, she was a phenomenal woman. So let me thank you again for your personal story and for telling us the story of Irma, because as I think of my congressional district and I think of a phenomenal family, I think of the Troy family, a family where I call her Mother Troy and Pastor Troy. They have four sons, but they have three daughter-in-laws who go out every day into the community, whether it is feeding a child, providing child care, or working with the homeless or in housing.

□ 2045

So in each of our communities we have stories because we understand in our communities that when women succeed, America succeeds. Thank you.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman JEFFRIES from the great State of New York, and it is, indeed, an honor, as he is coming to share with you that he represents the Eighth Congressional District.

He is no stranger to this platform. You see, as our colleague and classmate, we are standing in tonight as co-anchors because Congressman JEFFRIES is the real anchor. He and Congressman HORSFORD have been stellar in their leadership, in their scholarship, to come here for every Special Order hour under the Congressional Black Caucus and lead us in an agenda that makes a difference in the lives of so many people.

To have him here today, standing with us not only as a Congressman but as a spouse, as a father, sends a strong message that not only do women understand when women succeed, America succeeds, but men also understand it.

I yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding, as well as for the tremendous job that you have done anchoring this CBC Special Order along with our good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois.

It reminds me, back at home, sometimes the pastor in my church would have a guest preacher come and deliver the sermon for the occasion, and the guest preacher will do so well that he will remark afterward, it is a dangerous thing when you bring that type of preacher to the pulpit because the congregation may not want the main preacher to come back again.

You and Congresswoman KELLY have done such a tremendous job, certainly, STEVEN HORSFORD and I are at risk of losing our anchor positions. Nonethe-

less, we thank you for all that you have done.

It was a particular honor on Friday, along with Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE and Congresswoman KELLY and Congressmen GREG MEEKS and CHARLIE RANGEL, to be at the official unveiling held by the United States Postal Service of the Shirley Chisholm stamp to commemorate the life and times of this tremendous woman, this Member of Congress, this trailblazer, all that she had done.

I recall that she once made an observation to a young person who was considering a career in public service and asked Congresswoman Chisholm whether he should pursue this or not. Congresswoman Chisholm responded by saying to this young man interested in public service, Well, if you decide to run for office, don't be a career politician. She said, Be a statesperson. Representative Chisholm explained that the difference is, a career politician is only concerned with the next election, but a statesperson is concerned with the next generation.

As we stand here today, we would all do well to take that piece of advice that Congresswoman Chisholm uttered decades ago as it relates to the policy agenda connected to the theme "when women succeed, America succeeds" because, in order for that to be possible, we also have to be sensitive to what we are doing for the next generation of young people in the context of child care availability, universal pre-K, strengthening the Head Start program that has served so many over decades.

What are we doing for the next generation to make sure that women, in particular, who are raising up the future leaders of America, are equipped with the resources and the ability to provide them with the best possible upbringing?

Now, 50 years ago, in this Chamber, President Lyndon Baines Johnson spoke before a joint session of Congress and he declared a war on poverty. And we know that, as a result of that initiative, there were several legislative programs that were enacted into law between 1964 and 1966—Medicare, Medicaid, Head Start, school breakfast program, Food Stamp Act, college work study, minimum wage enhancement. All of these programs, taken together, contributed in a meaningful way to lifting millions of people out of poverty.

Now, we know, as we stand here today we have still got a lot of work to be done. But instead of there being a war on poverty, what we have seen far too often during this Congressional session and the previous one is a war on women. That is unfortunate that we have gone from trying to lift people up and give them an opportunity to pursue the American Dream to failing to deal with the issues that women in America face today and, in some instances, aggressively trying to roll back rights that were hard-fought and acquired over the years.

Now, as the President mentioned in this State of the Union that we all witnessed over the last week, that women in America make 77 cents for every dollar that a man earns. President Obama called it an embarrassment. I agree with that statement. It is also a national outrage.

How can it be the case that in America, in 2014, we are still allowing for such significant pay disparity that, as Congresswoman LEE pointed out, is even worse for women of color? So we have got to move forward under the principle—to bring to life the notion that one should be provided equal pay for equal work.

The second thing that we can do is to deal with this minimum wage issue that we have in America. As was pointed out earlier today, two-thirds of minimum wage earners in America are women. And so the failure to raise the minimum wage, to have indexed it appropriately for inflation to account for cost-of-living increases in America, disproportionately adversely affects women in this country. The reality is, with a minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour, a woman in America can work full-time, 35 hours per week, across an entire year and, in attempting to raise a family, fall well below the Federal poverty line. It is the classic definition of working poor.

So the failure to raise the minimum wage has consequences for women, for the family, and for the overall well-being of communities all across America, particularly when considering the fact that, in 40 percent of American households, women are either the primary or the sole breadwinner.

So that means, particularly as it relates to some of our good friends on the other side of the aisle who often express concern for family values—and I share that concern—the best family value is a good paycheck; because if you ensure that when people are working hard they are paid well for it, then we are ensuring that they have the capacity to take care of their families, of which women, increasingly, are the sole or primary breadwinners.

So I just commend my distinguished colleagues, Representative KELLY and Representative BEATTY, the dynamic duo of the CBC freshman class, for all that they have done and will continue to do on behalf of women, communities of color, and America in the context of their tremendous advocacy.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congressman JEFFRIES. And thank you for reminding us, if we could eliminate the wage gap, if we take, just in part of my district, in Columbus, in the metropolitan area, if we were able to eliminate the wage gap, it would allow women to have 77 more weeks of food; it would allow them to have six additional months more to pay their mortgage or rent; it would allow them to also have 2,555 gallons of gas to be able to take that child to child care or to go to work.

So it is so important that we understand the agenda and why we stand

here today as members of the Congressional Black Caucus advocating for women in this agenda, because we understand, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor now, to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey. And we share a common bond: his father from New Jersey, my father from New Jersey. He is someone who understands all too well the value of when women succeed, America succeeds. He is a spouse; he is a father of triplets. And so it is so important, when we talk about early childhood education and when we talk about childhood, child care, that we understand that he understands, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me just acknowledge my colleagues from the freshman class, the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Illinois, for anchoring this hour. When Women Succeed, America Succeeds.

I now am one of two members of the freshman class that has not had the opportunity to anchor this hour. Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES have done such an exceptional job in that. As Mr. JEFFRIES pointed out, Mrs. BEATTY is always ready for the challenge and has demonstrated and, as was mentioned earlier, has stepped up to the plate and hit the ground running in the Halls of Congress and has demonstrated her leadership on numerous occasions.

With that, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that we know we have made great progress in this country closing the gender wage gap; but women still, as it has been stated, and we need to continue to let it resonate, earn just 77 cents on every dollar a man earns for the same work. And for women of color, unfortunately, naturally, I am not surprised, the gap is even wider, with women of color earning just 64 cents for every dollar that a man makes.

In New Jersey, the gap has even grown worse. In just 1 year, women in New Jersey earn, on an average, \$13,000 less than their male counterparts. Now, that is shocking. That is absolutely incredible that the gap, the margin is that wide, because over the course of that woman's lifetime, that adds up to more than \$434,000.

Now, what could a family over their lifetime do with another \$435,000? Probably could own a nicer home, send all their children to college, live in a manner in which all Americans deserve to live in.

□ 2100

What we have is working poor. \$434,000—that is a significant amount of money over the course of someone's life. That is not the America that I was raised to believe in. The home of the free, the land of the brave. Equality is always discussed, but there are always

underlying factors in why those words are not lived up to for some people—particularly in this case, women.

Mr. Speaker, we live in the 21st century. Women now make up more than half of our workforce. As President Obama said last week in his State of the Union Address, paying women less is just plain wrong. In 2014, it is an embarrassment, and we all agree with him in that respect.

This gross gender pay inequality doesn't hurt just women. It hurts families, and it hurts our local economy as well. I don't know in my case of a husband who is happy that his wife is working that hard and making 77 percent of what she deserves to make. Any way you look at it, it is lost revenue coming into the home, and it could make such a difference on small things—vacations, education, groceries, food, sustenance to make it through the week, the month, the year.

On top of that, a woman shouldn't have to feel like she may lose her job if she takes time off to care for her sick children. Now this is something that I know all too well, Mr. Speaker. I know that my wife and I were very fortunate to have the FMLA while we were raising our triplets, you see, because one would get sick, then the next one would get sick, then the next one would get sick, then I would get sick, then my wife would get sick, and it would start all over again. There is no way either one of us could care for them while worrying about whether she is going to have a job to return to, but still today, too many women have to choose between being employed and caring for their families. It is just not right, and it is just not fair.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the greatest nation on Earth, no one who puts in a 40-hour workweek should be living in poverty, ever. They are playing by the rules. They are getting up every day, working hard, two and three jobs sometimes, and still not making ends meet. No one in this Nation that plays by the rules should find themselves in that condition. In this country, it is just not about having a job, but it is about having a good job.

More than two-thirds of minimum wage earners are women. We owe it to them to pay them a wage that they could actually live on and provide for their families because we know, Mr. Speaker, in many cases, that woman is the wage earner in the home, the only wage earner in the home, and to have them find themselves in that condition is unfathomable in the 21st century.

I was very encouraged by the President's actions to raise the wage for new government workers. It makes sense. It makes sense in this day and age to have a living wage, something you can take care of your family on. Congress needs to follow that example.

There are many things that this Congress could do to ensure that women succeed. Pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, pass the Family Act, and raise the minimum wage for all. All of these

measures have been blocked by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but the success of women in America cannot and should not be bipartisan as an issue.

We must put our political differences aside and show this country that we care and we understand. We owe it to our mothers, we owe it to our wives, and we owe it to our daughters to provide them with the quality of life that they deserve.

So I implore my fellow Americans that are watching this tonight, whether your Member is a Democrat or a Republican, to see where they stand on this issue, to check how they are voting in your interests, and if they are not voting in your interests, then you should remove them. Because when women succeed, America succeeds.

I yield back.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congressman PAYNE. "Land of the free, home of the brave"—it reminds me of the words that Leader PELOSI talked about during the 165th anniversary of the Seneca Falls Convention, the first women's rights convention that addressed women in social, economic, and political life. It said that women should be granted all the rights and privileges that men possess. So thank you for that message.

As we continue in this hour, I would like to yield to my coanchor, the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman.

I, too, feel compelled to tell my Shirley Chisholm story. As you have heard, I was privileged enough to be at the unveiling of her stamp, and I was very, very proud to be there, but also, I met Shirley Chisholm 22 years ago. I was a director of minority student services for Bradley University, and we invited Congresswoman Chisholm out to be a speaker. I picked her up from the airport and drove her back when her time was done.

We had the opportunity to have coffee together, and I felt her passion for the everyday person, to improve their quality of life. Little did I know that she was planting a little seed in me, as she was the first black woman elected, and I am the 30th and hopefully counting black woman elected to Congress. So I am very proud of that moment, and it gave me that opportunity to reflect when I heard all of her stories last Friday.

You have heard from our many colleagues that nearly half of the workforce is female, yet two-thirds of all minimum wage workers are women. You have heard 40 percent of working women are their family's primary breadwinner. If these women were paid the same wages as their male counterparts, their family income would increase by \$6,776 a year. This is a \$245 billion increase in wealth nationwide. If women receive equal pay, our economy would generate \$447.6 billion in additional income. Again, we all would benefit from this, not just women.

41.5 million adult women and 16.8 million adult working women live in households below 200 percent of the poverty line. Women workers, single mothers, and low-income workers are the least likely to have access to paid leave and workplace flexibility offered through their employer, only exacerbating gender inequality and women's poverty.

The United States, as we said, the wealthiest country in the world, is the only developed nation that does not require employers to provide paid maternity leave, and the family and medical leave protections that do exist fail to cover nearly half of all full-time employees.

Revenue of women-owned businesses is 27 percent of that of men-owned businesses. I remember when I was a State representative, thanks to SEIU, being a child care worker for a day, and I went into the home of a woman who took care of other children for other women so that they could go to work. Both the child care worker and the mom going to work were very low-wage earners, but if it wasn't for that low-wage earner or child care worker, the mom couldn't afford to pay her so she could then go to work. It would be easy for the moms to stay home, but they didn't want to stay home. They wanted to work. They wanted to build their resume, and they also wanted to give their children the opportunity to be around other children and to learn from those low-wage child care workers. So both groups of women are affected by the minimum wage in this country.

With that, I yield back, Congresswoman.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much for sharing your stories, as my coanchor.

All evening, we have heard the stories of women who have advocated and fought in these Chambers, women like Shirley Chisholm. We know the stories all too well of the Rosa Parks, of the Barbara Jordans. Then as we look to education, we know the stories of women who serve as presidents of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, women like Dr. Johnnetta Cole, women like Cynthia Jackson-Hammond at my alma mater, Central State University. We know women who have worked and earned their place in history because they understand that when women succeed, America succeeds.

We know the stories of our parents. But one thing tonight I want to make sure that we add to these resources when we talk about economic development and we talk about child care and we talk about all the other services, pay equity and health care, and that is the right to vote. That is one of the most critical things that I want us to remember, because when we get people registered to vote and then we allow them to be able to vote, that is one of the most powerful tools.

The story we don't hear when we talk about "when women succeed, America

succeeds" is the story of a little lady from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, a lady by the name of Oseola McCarty. The name probably won't mean a lot to a lot of people. She was someone who was a washer woman. She washed clothes for women who didn't look like her or think like her and many who probably didn't even know her name, but this woman in her own little wisdom truly understood the value of when women succeed, America succeeds.

You know why? She took her pay every week, and she put it in a jar, and she saved, and you see, she didn't have children. She didn't have a spouse or brothers and sisters, and she wrote a little note saying that she wanted these dollars to go to a child that was underserved, a child who would be able to take these few dollars and get a college education because that would make a difference in that child's life. Well, at the time of her death, someone opened up that container. And in that container, there was an estimated amount of \$150,000.

So when I think about "when women succeed, America succeeds," I will add the name of Oseola McCarty to that list, because that is what we are talking about tonight. When we talk about members of the Congressional Black Caucus being the conscience of the Congress, it means that when we stand on this House floor advocating for folks who are voiceless, that is our role.

So when we seem so passionate and so concerned when some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle stand in the way of providing health care for women, for providing early childhood education or wanting to make a difference in how we feed our poor, then it reminds me of all the stories that we have heard today.

□ 2115

It reminds me of all the women who are fighting because they understand that there are faces on all of the statistics that we have heard tonight. And all of these faces, whether well-known or not, when you go back to your districts, understand when you stand with us as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, as you stand with us, with women in our caucus, you are standing with all the women across America. And the message you are sending is, when women succeed, America succeeds.

It is my great honor to ask my co-anchor tonight to close us out and ask everyone to remember that we are here, and, yes, I will say it again, when women succeed, America succeeds.

I yield to the gentlelady from Illinois.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman. You make me think about my grandmother, because it was my grandmother in the late 1940s who purchased a grocery store and told my grandfather, We are in the grocery business now. It was because of her parents instilling in her and helping

her to succeed and be a role model that she planted a seed for our family and her sons and then my father and my uncle. And it just fed the line for success and all of us going to college because of my grandmother. She was the very strong one in the family.

America cannot afford to maintain the status quo. Nearly 70 percent of Americans on or above the brink of poverty are women and the children who depend on them. That is almost 42 million American women and more than 28 million American children living on or at the brink of poverty. Tonight's conversation is about sparking an agenda that will enable women to achieve greater security. This includes raising wages for women and their families and allowing working parents to support and care for their families.

I want to thank the entire Congressional Black Caucus, especially my fellow co-anchor, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman BEATTY, who did a fantastic job.

As we recognize Black History Month, we are reminded the Congressional Black Caucus exists to improve communities through policy action that meets the needs of millions of our most vulnerable citizens. It is that spirit that guides us here tonight. When we see millions of women and children on the brink of poverty, we must act. When we see total household incomes being short-changed because of gender biases in wage, we won't stand for it. When women succeed, America succeeds. I will say it again. When women succeed, America succeeds.

I thank my colleagues for caring enough to get involved in this debate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. With that, I yield to my co-anchor, Representative BEATTY, for any last words.

Mrs. BEATTY. Let me just say as we close out that it is so important that you understand that our message tonight is certainly about making a difference in the lives of those who live in this wonderful country. So let me end as we started with, when women succeed, America succeeds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived audience.

#### A NATION DIVIDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address you here on the

floor of the United States House of Representatives and to take up some of the issues that I know are important to you and are important to Americans. I come here tonight to try to put some perspective on this intense debate that we have had.

I would start with this, Mr. Speaker, that over Christmas vacation, I don't know of a time that this Congress hasn't taken a break over Christmas and gone back to celebrate the birth of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. That is the foundation of the core of the faith of our Founding Fathers that established this country, built this Capitol, and worshipped in the building.

I do remember a Christmas Eve present that we got from the United States Senate Christmas Eve morning when they passed a version of ObamaCare on a Christmas Eve vote, but I don't remember a President ever criticizing Congress for leaving town to go visit our families over Christmas vacation until this year when our President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, made his trip to his home State of Hawaii and took his Christmas break out there. He took his family with him, and certainly most thinking Americans don't object to such a thing, but I remember a speech that he gave from Hawaii where he criticized Congress for leaving town over Christmas. He said that we should have stayed here in Washington and solved this myriad of problems we have in our Nation, that going home apparently was inappropriate.

Well, I think when they were here, when the Senate was in voting on Christmas Eve morning that morning when they delivered to us ObamaCare, that was the time they should have gone home for Christmas vacation instead and listened to the American people, because the aftermath of that was that there was a huge wave election in 2010, and Republicans in the House of Representatives ended up with 87 freshman Republicans as a result of the American people's rejecting ObamaCare.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I bring up the point of the President's criticism of Congress for taking Christmas off and point out three other topics that he brought up in that speech. He said he has an agenda for 2014—and this was a preview of his State of the Union address, I might add—and this agenda that the President has for 2014 includes three things: the extension of unemployment benefits, adding weeks on what his number really is—but I know that they have supported 99 weeks, almost 2 years of unemployment—and then the other piece of it was to increase the minimum wage. He is seeking to do that by an executive edict with regard to the Federal employees. And the third piece was he called upon Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Now, when you are home with your family over Christmas and you hear a

speech like that from the President of the United States, the first thing you think is why in the world would he go before the American people with any kind of a message, let alone one like that? Don't take a Christmas break, and I am going to tell Congress what they ought to do. They ought to pass a minimum wage increase; they should extend unemployment benefits; and they should pass—the President said this to us before—the Senate version of the Gang of 8's comprehensive immigration reform bill.

I point out, also, Mr. Speaker, that America now understands that comprehensive immigration reform—CIR, for short—really is three words that encompass one word, and that is “amnesty.”

One would wonder why the President chose those three topics and gave that speech at that time. I would give this answer, Mr. Speaker: no one should really wonder. A President of one party that has the same party that rules in the United States Senate and controls the agenda over there, who is opposed by Republicans in the House of Representatives, is going to do this predictably, because tactically it is what you do in this business if you are not a uniter but a divider, and that is pick the topics that unify your party and divide the opposing party.

So he picked three topics that just essentially and almost universally—I will say, virtually—unify the Democrat Party and are designed to split and divide the Republican Party—minimum wage, for example. Now, I can go back quite a ways on how far back the minimum wage goes. But I can say, Mr. Speaker, that every time that Congress has raised the minimum wage, somebody has lost a job. It has cost jobs every time. We lose more and more of those entry-level job opportunities when the minimum wage goes up because the employers can't afford to train unskilled workers and put them in the workforce and take on all of the risk, the regulation, the recordkeeping, the liability, and sometimes the benefits package that is required. They can't afford to pay all of that and bring somebody into the workforce that has maybe no skills.

The reason that there are entry-level wages is so that people can get started in a job and you can afford as an employer to hire them and keep them there and upgrade their job skills, and hopefully in the same company you can move them right on up through the chain and bring them up through the system, and their wages and their benefit package, or at least their wages, go up with that consistently.

I happen to know how that works. We have never—I founded and have operated a construction company for 28 years. In those 28 years, we have never paid minimum wage. We have always paid over that. But when we brought somebody in at a skill level, we identified their skills, paid them what we thought we could afford to pay them,

trained them, watched to see how they developed, and gave them raises in proportion to the skill level and the production that they gave because, after all, when they come to work, they would say, What is my job? And I said, Well, your job is to help me make money. If you do that, then I want you to stay here, and we are going to do our best to take care of you.

Mr. Speaker, I recall walking into my construction office in one of those years, perhaps in the early nineties, and my secretary had decorated the Christmas tree in the entryway of our office. I looked at the tree. It looked nice, and it had decorations on it. I don't usually pay much attention to those things, and I walked on.

She said to me, Well, did you notice the tree? And I said, Yes, I did.

And isn't it pretty? was her question. Sure, the tree was pretty. She said, Go back and look at it a little more closely.

I went back and looked at that tree more closely, and it was symmetrical, symmetrically decorated. It didn't have any lights on it, and it didn't have any tinsel on it. All it had on it for decorations were gold Christmas emblems that were a thin piece of something thicker than foil but that kind of a texture, gold. And it would be, oh, a snowflake, a star, a baby Jesus and different pieces from the nativity scene all over that tree. Then I looked at that, and I said, Yeah, those are nice. She said, Look a little closer. She turned one of the decorations around on the back side, and on the back side there was engraved the name of one of our employees. And you look at another, and it would be their spouse. And you look at another, it would be one of our employees' children.

By the time I had looked at those decorations on that tree, it occurred to me that the decisions that I was making that were designed to help the company make money also impacted the lives of not just the people that we were writing the paycheck to, but their spouse, their children, and their family members, and that the responsibility of those decisions impacted all of the names on that tree directly.

It is quite a thing to walk in and understand that, Mr. Speaker, and see how that is. But all of those people on that tree benefited from the decisions I made, hopefully; and we benefited, all of us together, from the work we did together.

That is the way companies are supposed to be—good companies especially. Small companies operate like families. Good companies today, large companies, talk about the culture of the workplace. They want that culture to be a culture that brings people back again, people that look forward to going to work every day. They want people to look forward to working with their colleagues and their coworkers, and they compete for good labor.

So we don't need a Federal Government that gets in between an employer

and an employee. This system of entry-level wages that gets people started in a job where they can learn a skill, learn customer relations, learn responsibility, learn to look people in the eye, learn to provide service, learn to smile and hustle and act like you like it, if you can do that, you are not going to be working for minimum wage very long.

But the President and the Democrats want to divide that and put that minimum wage out of reach of a lot of employers, which means a lot of especially young people with no skills aren't going to get the opportunity. Divide, unify—virtually unify the Democrats—and divide the Republicans with minimum wage.

The next thing, extending unemployment benefits to 99 weeks, Mr. Speaker? How can we possibly afford paying people not to work for 99 weeks? The long tradition in this country has been 26 weeks, a half a year.

Now, a lot of times it is not people's fault when they get laid off. It might be seasonal; it might be the company folds; it might be the company downsizes. But that unemployment that is there is to give them a bridge to find another job, whatever they need to do to find that other job. And if this government decides, this Congress decides that we are going to borrow money, borrow money from the American people to run this government, borrow money from the Saudis, borrow money from the Chinese—\$1.3 trillion borrowed from the Chinese—so that we can extend unemployment benefits and sometimes provide early retirement for people that decide, "Well, I can qualify for 99 weeks of unemployment. I will be 65 by then. I can qualify then for Medicare, Social Security, and my pension plan. There is no reason for me to find a job at age 63 because this Federal Government has managed to add on to 99 weeks of unemployment," it is not a wise thing to do. It is a bad policy for our economy, and it causes our workforce skills to atrophy, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2130

So, having dispatched minimum wage and having dispatched extending unemployment benefits, now we are down to the third thing. In each case, unemployment benefits and extending unemployment benefits also, it is borrowed money to fund those projects that unify Democrats and divide Republicans. Part of the Republicans are going to say I am going to go along with that because I don't want to take the political heat, and inside they are going to think it is not a good thing for this country. They do the same thing on the minimum wage, increasing the minimum wage. So the President is dividing Republicans and he is unifying Democrats against Republicans.

The third thing is this: the proposal that this Congress pass comprehensive immigration reform, CIR/amnesty, that is the big one of the three divisive agenda items that the President rolled

out after he criticized Congress for taking Christmas off to visit our families.

Some of the result has been the pressure felt by some of the leadership in this Congress to produce a document that is called "Standards for Immigration Reform." So I received this document Thursday afternoon about 4:15 and I looked through this. These are principles on immigration, Mr. Speaker. I looked through this, and it has a preamble that starts out: "Our Nation's immigration system is broken." Well, that is the first half of the first sentence, and already I disagree.

Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is not broken. We have a system of laws and a system set up for enforcement. It is not the system that is broken; it is the President of the United States who has prohibited his law enforcement officers from actually following the law. When the law expressly dictates that when encountered, they need to place people who are unlawfully in the United States in removal proceedings, and the President has prohibited ICE, for example, and the Border Patrol, from carrying out the law, it is not the system that is broken; it is the President who has taken an oath of office that includes that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and I would close quote there, and that includes that the President is instead taking care that the law is not being faithfully executed, and there are at least five different violations of his constitutional limitations with regard to immigration. There are multiple others, Mr. Speaker.

The Constitution is at great risk because of the—I wanted to say "cavalier," but instead I would say because of the willful—disregard and disrespect for the Constitution that we have seen as the President has gone down the line and violated this Constitution multiple times.

For example, the President has suspended Welfare to Work. When that legislation was written back in the middle 1990s, and I know the author of that legislation, it was carefully and specifically written so that the President couldn't waive the work component of TANF, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. Even though the language is specific and the language is as tight as they could think to write it at the time, the President has decided we are going to provide TANF benefits, but there is not going to be a work component.

Of the 80 different means-tested welfare programs we have in the United States, at least 80 of them, only one required work. All of the hubbub on the floor of the House of Representatives in the 1990s about Welfare to Work, there was going to be welfare reform and people were going to be transitioning from welfare to work, all of that hubbub resulted in one policy, one program that required work: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. The President suspended the work component.

The President suspended No Child Left Behind. The President supported

and his minions carried out the Morton memos, which reversed immigration law, made up new immigration law, and ordered that they not enforce immigration law against people that apparently didn't make the President feel politically vulnerable.

So that is just part of this. That takes us also, Mr. Speaker, down to ObamaCare. In ObamaCare there have been multiple times that the President has violated the law that carries his name and his signature. The first and the most egregious—excuse me, not the first, the most egregious, was when the President announced some time last year that he was going to delay the implementation of the employer mandate.

Now, the law, Mr. Speaker, the ObamaCare law says that the employer mandate shall commence in each month after December of 2013. That means it starts in January, a month ago. We are into February now. The President has announced he is going to delay it for a year. He has no authority, he has no constitutional authority to delay the implementation of ObamaCare. None. Yet, he extended the individual mandate, delayed the employer mandate.

When the conscience protection was being violated in the rules that were written by the Department of Human Services, he decided every large employer, large employers had to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations as part of their health insurance policies, and religious organizations and individuals objected. They said I am not going to be violating my conscience. The law cannot compel me, because of my religious beliefs, to violate my religious beliefs. That is a First Amendment right, the protection of the freedom of religion. But the President insisted even the Catholic Church would have to comply.

For 2 weeks of national hubbub, the President held his ground. Until noon on a Friday, and a lot of these things happen, Mr. Speaker, around noon on a Friday, the President stepped out to the podium and said, I have heard this discussion that religious organizations don't want to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations—and abortifacients, Mr. Speaker, are abortion-causing pills. The religious organizations don't want to do this, and so now I am going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations. An accommodation, and the accommodation he made is, he said, I am now going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free, and he repeated himself, provide these things for free.

So I thought okay, if there is going to be a change in policy, I bet I will see it come back before the floor of the House of Representatives, and I will have an opportunity to debate, perhaps offer an amendment, and vote on this change. Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't really think that, I just knew that is what the Constitution would require

before there could be a change in the law, but there actually was a rule. So I checked the rule. Did they propose a rule change? Did they publish it? Did they go through the administrative procedures requirements in order to get a rule change?

The first thing you do is you go back and read the rule. Did anything change in the rule that compelled the churches to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations, as compared to the insurance companies, as the President said in his press conference. No, Mr. Speaker, there was no change in the regulations. The only thing that changed was the President gave a speech, and in that speech, he said religious organizations, you don't have to do this any more. Insurance companies, you have to do this now.

What a reach. What a constitutional overreach for a President to believe that because he spoke, millions would line up and swoon at the very words of a President of the United States who again is going beyond the bounds of the authority vested in him, limited by the Constitution of the United States. That just gives a sample of some of some of the things that are going on, Mr. Speaker.

I bring this up because the President said to Congress: Pass comprehensive immigration reform. He also said if he is not satisfied with the results, if Congress doesn't move fast enough, he has an ink pen and he has a cell phone, and he will just run the government by signing executive orders. That was part of the promise that he made behind me, Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union address last week.

Well, so some in this Congress think if we try to catch up with the President, we can get along with him, and that's why you see this language here in the preamble of the Standards for Immigration Reform that says our immigration system is broken. Well, it is not broken. What is broken is the trust between the American people and the bond that is required when the President gives his oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, not take it apart by executive action that we can't catch up with through litigation.

If the President doesn't respect his oath to the Constitution, and if the President doesn't respect the legitimate congressional authority under article 1 that the Congress has, why would he then respect a decision made by a court, especially a lower court, a circuit court. Maybe, just maybe, public opinion would force him to respect a Supreme Court, but, Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that we will see a case get to the Supreme Court before this President is finally signing off in his last year of office.

I look at the points on this Standards for Immigration Reform, and there are four different provisions. One is border security and interior enforcement. It

says that must come first. Of course we know that they would legalize everybody first, and then they are going to try to secure our borders. It says secure our borders and verify they are secure. The difficulty with that is, who is going to decide when they are secure? I would hand it over to the Texas border sheriffs, along with New Mexico, Arizona, and California. I would hand it over to the local government people and let them decide. If the States would certify the borders are secure, if the sheriffs would certify that the borders are secure, and if the county supervisors would certify that they are secure, we would have a pretty good answer as to whether they are secure, but we have heard those promises before. Janet Napolitano made it clear that she thought the borders were secure. Of course, I don't believe that.

When I mentioned earlier in a media program that just the children, the unaccompanied children that are being picked up along our southern border are running up to the numbers where for this year it is going to tally 50,000; 50,000 children, some of them little kids, tiny little kids who are being handed over to coyotes to be brought into the United States so they can qualify for the promise of the DREAM Act—50,000 kids. That is not out of me; that is from the president of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement union, Chris Crane, who is a plaintiff in a lawsuit, by the way, that is stalled and sidetracked over to Eric Holder and other places.

Next point is Implement an Exit/Entry Visa Tracking System. Supposedly these are the broken parts of the immigration system. They are going to enforce the border because something is broken and they need to pass a new law. We have the resources to enforce the law. We are spending over \$12 billion on the southern border, and for about \$8 billion, we could build a four-lane interstate all of the way from the Pacific Ocean clear down to Brownsville. But then the Entry-Exit Visa System was passed into law. That is the law. It was passed into law in 1996. We have an entry system but not an exit system, so there is no balance of who is here. By the way, if you get that working, who is going to keep track who is here, at least theoretically, and how are you possibly going to enforce that given that you have sanctuary cities and you have the equivalent of sanctuary States and you have an administration that refuses to allow their own people who are hired to do so to enforce the law? I don't know why this is a new piece; it has been the law since 1996. If we can't get that law enforced, why would a new one be enforced if this one is not?

Item number three, Employer Verification and Workplace Enforcement. That is actually pretty good. That is the E-Verify program, and the language defines it. It says they need a workable electronic employment verification system. Now, if you make that



mandatory, you wonder about the freedom of the American people that now have to prove that they are an American before they can go to work. That is a new burden of proof that we haven't had before. I don't want to speak too strongly against that, Mr. Speaker. I would just say instead that my new IDEA Act is a better idea. What it does is it clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not deductible for Federal income tax purposes. It allows the IRS to come in and do an audit. In that audit, they can run the names of the employees through E-Verify, and if the employer uses E-Verify, they get safe harbor on any violations of hiring people who can't lawfully work in the United States. The IRS can look at that and say you had a chance for safe harbor, you didn't use E-Verify. These employees can't lawfully work in the United States, and you can't lawfully deduct the wages and benefits you paid to them. It is not a business expense to break the law. So the IRS would deny those business expenses for salary and benefits, and they can attach interest and penalty. So your \$10-an-hour illegal becomes about a \$16-an-hour illegal, and you have voluntary compliance with E-Verify. It is a much better situation. Point number three isn't so bad.

Reforms to the legal immigration system. That is, they want to accelerate legal immigration, Mr. Speaker, and the needs of employers and the desire for those exceptional individuals to help our economy. Well, there is some truth in that, but we are bringing in 1.2 million legal immigrants a year and giving them an opportunity, a path to citizenship; 1.2 million. Now, those folks who want to change all this policy and grant amnesty for everybody that is here, and then open the doors up for an accelerated legal immigration to go on after that, to the tens of millions, and we are not talking about 11 million; we are talking about 11 million times some multiplying factor that is probably closer to three times or more than that say over the next 20 years.

□ 2145

We need to come to a conclusion as to what is an appropriate number of legal immigrants to come into America. I think 1.2 million is plenty generous. I think then we should start to upgrade those applicants so that they are young, they have education, they have language skills, they have learning capacity, they have an ability to simulate into the American culture and the American civilization and contribute and pay taxes so that they carry their share of the load because the day is going to come that they are not.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I take us down to the lower end of this. First, the DREAM Act gets addressed, and it pretty much embraces DICK DURBIN'S DREAM Act. Of course, I reject that for the sake of this, that, again, it rewards lawbreakers.

But in the final paragraph, the concluding paragraph, it says: "individuals living outside the rule of law." It says, Mr. Speaker: "There will be no special path to citizenship for individuals who broke our Nation's immigration laws." There would be no special path to citizenship.

Well, let me just say that if you put people on a path to citizenship who are in this country illegally while you have 5 million people waiting outside the United States who do respect our laws, then you have given a special path to citizenship. The nonspecial path is for those folks to go back into their home country and line up behind the 5 million who are lined up in their home country today waiting, respecting our laws to come into the United States; otherwise, it is a special path to citizenship.

But they go on and they say: "that would be unfair to those immigrants who have played by the rules and harmful to promoting the rule of law." That is breathtaking in its concept. We are going to provide a special path to citizenship because it would be harmful to promoting the rule of law, except we are going to legalize all of those people that have broken the law. And we are not going to ask them to go back to their home country and get in the back of the line; we are going to let them stay here and it won't matter whether they are in a line or not. They were satisfied to live in the shadows of America—that is what they came here to do—or else they came here on the promise of amnesty like those kids that are coming across our southern border now to line up for the DREAM Act, 50,000 strong in a year.

"Harmful to promoting the rule of law." No. What they are proposing here is destructive to the rule of law.

It goes on further and it says: "from here on, our immigration laws will indeed be enforced." There is another breathtaking statement, Mr. Speaker. Immigration laws from here on would indeed be enforced.

I am very confident, and I have not looked, but I am very confident that I can go into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the House and in the Senate and go back to 1986 and pull the debate out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and point to you where time after time a Member of Congress, House and Senate, said, We are going to pass this amnesty act, and from here on, indeed, our laws will be enforced; we will restore the rule of law from this point forward, but first we must grant amnesty.

Those are the words from 1986. Those are the words from this document that was released just last Thursday. And those have always been the myopic words of people who believe in open borders more so than they believe and have reverence for our rule of law, which we still have the opportunity to restore, even from the 86th Amnesty Act, the rule of law.

If we fail to do so here and now, if this amnesty is granted, the rule of law

will not be restored within the lifetime of this Republic, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities with regard to the President.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2860. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1901—An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 4, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4629. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report from the Office of Financial Research for 2013; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4630. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report on Human Capital Planning; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4631. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 10-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with the Kingdom of Belgium, Australia, Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Kingdom of Norway, Portugal, the Kingdom of Spain, and

Turkiye; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training FY 2013 Annual Report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4633. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Agency for International Development, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4634. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting four reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4635. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting thirty reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4636. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4637. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Certified Business Enterprise Expenditures of Public-Private Development Construction Projects for Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4638. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Regulations; Exempted Senior Employee Positions (RIN: 3209-AA14) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4639. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0706; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-067-AD; Amendment 39-17708; AD 2013-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4640. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0421; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-003-AD; Amendment 39-17701; AD 2013-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4641. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0340; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-081-AD; Amendment 39-17630; AD 2013-21-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4642. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0603; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-079-AD; Amendment 39-17706; AD 2013-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4643. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0370; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-034-AD; Amendment 39-17711; AD 2013-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4644. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1030; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-193-AD; Amendment 39-17712; AD 2013-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4645. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0304; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-17713; AD 2013-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4646. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0407; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-17710; AD 2013-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4647. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with Wing Lift Struts [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0023; Directorate Identifier 96-CE-072-AD; Amendment 39-17688; AD 99-01-052 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4648. A letter from the Chair, NASA Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel, transmitting the Panel's Annual Report for 2013; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 470. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-339).

Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LOFGREEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. PAL-LONE):

H.R. 3982. A bill to provide that the rules of the Federal Communications Commission re-

lating to preserving the open Internet and broadband industry practices shall be restored to effect until the date when the Commission takes final action in the proceedings on such rules that were remanded to the Commission by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 3983. A bill to establish a competitive grant program assisting the development of innovative early learning curricula for low-income children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3984. A bill to establish an Early Learning Challenge Fund to support States in building and strengthening systems of high-quality early learning and development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3985. A bill to sunset funding under sections 1341 and 1342, and to repeal section 1343, of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CHU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 471. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 3, 2014, through February 7, 2014, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 3982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the Commerce Clause of Article I of the United States Constitution, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 3983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 3984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. HIMES.  
 H.R. 164: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 318: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 322: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 333: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
 H.R. 352: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 455: Ms. CHU, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FARR, Ms. MENG, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. NEAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PETERS of California.  
 H.R. 508: Mr. REED.  
 H.R. 721: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 946: Mr. FLORES.  
 H.R. 1009: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 1010: Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 1281: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 1286: Ms. DELBENE.  
 H.R. 1354: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
 H.R. 1648: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1701: Mr. FLEMING.  
 H.R. 1717: Ms. GABBARD.  
 H.R. 1726: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1869: Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
 H.R. 2035: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 2123: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 2328: Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 2415: Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H.R. 2484: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 2502: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 2553: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 2560: Mr. POCAN.  
 H.R. 2575: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 2638: Mr. BARTON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. COFFMAN.  
 H.R. 2651: Mr. HARPER and Mr. LANCE.  
 H.R. 2694: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
 H.R. 2767: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
 H.R. 2780: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 2847: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 2904: Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 2905: Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 2907: Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 2921: Mr. BENISHEK.  
 H.R. 2994: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PETRI, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 2997: Mr. CULBERSON.  
 H.R. 2998: Mr. O'ROURKE.  
 H.R. 3040: Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H.R. 3116: Ms. MOORE and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 3301: Mrs. WALORSKI.  
 H.R. 3382: Ms. BASS, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3384: Mr. PETERS of California and Mrs. WALORSKI.  
 H.R. 3392: Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 3395: Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 3408: Mr. LATTA and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.  
 H.R. 3450: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 3471: Ms. GABBARD.  
 H.R. 3482: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 3485: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. PERRY.  
 H.R. 3486: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.  
 H.R. 3493: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 3494: Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 3513: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 3529: Mr. STIVERS.  
 H.R. 3530: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.  
 H.R. 3538: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.  
 H.R. 3539: Mr. BROWN of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3541: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3556: Mr. FARR and Mr. CAMPBELL.  
 H.R. 3578: Mrs. CAPITO and Ms. JENKINS.  
 H.R. 3590: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. STOCKMAN.  
 H.R. 3620: Ms. WATERS.  
 H.R. 3635: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
 H.R. 3658: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Ms. DELBENE.  
 H.R. 3671: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 3689: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. POMPEO.  
 H.R. 3697: Mr. POLLS.  
 H.R. 3711: Mr. GRAYSON.  
 H.R. 3712: Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 3717: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 3727: Mr. COTTON.  
 H.R. 3732: Ms. FOXX.  
 H.R. 3738: Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 3740: Mr. ENYART and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 3747: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 3753: Mr. PETERS of California.  
 H.R. 3757: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 3789: Ms. GABBARD.  
 H.R. 3790: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 3794: Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 3824: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 3855: Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. DELBENE.  
 H.R. 3863: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. YODER, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3864: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
 H.R. 3865: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. HURT.  
 H.R. 3870: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3877: Mr. CLAY and Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 3892: Ms. CHU and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 3930: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 3954: Mr. DENT.  
 H.R. 3964: Mr. BARR and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3971: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 3972: Ms. BASS, Ms. CHU, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 3979: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PITTINGER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H.J. Res. 25: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H. Con. Res. 78: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H. Res. 35: Mr. LANKFORD.  
 H. Res. 109: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H. Res. 153: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H. Res. 302: Ms. GRANGER.  
 H. Res. 356: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
 H. Res. 387: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H. Res. 447: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H. Res. 457: Ms. CHU, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H. Res. 463: Mr. ENYART.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

## OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The amendment filed to the Committee Print for H.R. 3590 by me does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.